

Measuring Work-Relevant Attitudes

The Measurement of Work-Relevant Attitudes: A Program Report on the Development of a Measuring Instrument by Regis H. Walther, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., February 1969 (Contract No. 41-7-004-9).

This is an initial report on the development of a self-report which might be used to measure work-relevant attitudes. It is generally recognized that attitudes play a critical role in adjustment to work. Success or failure of work experience or work-training programs thus depends in large part on the work-relevant attitudes of enrollees. And yet to date there is no agreement as to the ways in which attitudes affect work performance, or how they should be measured.

Literature was reviewed on a number of variables considered most significant in an understanding of attitudes formed as a consequence of poverty—self-esteem, impulse control, deferred gratification, perspective on the future, achievement motivation, optimism, and self-confidence—and the authors concluded that these variables might well be considered work-relevant attitudes. The next step was to select a measuring instrument.

They decided that a self-report inventory would present fewer problems and entail less expense than other possible instruments. An exploratory study was undertaken. Some 72 items were selected for use in the initial inventory, which was then administered to two groups of youth in Cincinnati and Durham. Analysis of the data revealed three interpretable factors—optimism, unsocialized attitudes, and self-confidence.

A revised inventory was then developed, reduced to 34 items. It can be administered in from 10 to 15 minutes. This revised form is being applied to about 100 enrollees in the NYC program in the Cincinnati and Durham New Careers programs. A sample of 200 youth in Cincinnati will be used for comparison purposes. The returns from the self-report inventory are now being analyzed and its usefulness will be further tested before a final report is issued.

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

For more information on manpower programs and services in your area, contact your local employment service office or the nearest office of the Regional Manpower Administrator at the address listed below:

Location	States Served
John F. Kennedy Fed. Bldg. Boston, Mass. 02203 (617) 223-6726	Connecticut Maine Massachusetts
341 Ninth Avenue New York, N. Y. 10001 (212) 971-7564	New Jersey New York Canal Zone
5000 Wissahickon Avenue Philadelphia, Penna. 19144 (215) 438-5200	Delaware Maryland Pennsylvania
D. C. Manpower Administrator 14th and E Streets, NW. Washington, D. C. 20004 (202) 629-3663	District of Columbia
1371 Peachtree Street, NE. Atlanta, Ga. 30309 (404) 526-3267	Alabama Florida Georgia Kentucky
219 South Dearborn Street Chicago, Ill. 60604 (312) 353-4258	Illinois Indiana Michigan
411 North Akard Street Dallas, Tex. 75201 (214) 749-3671	Arkansas Louisiana New Mexico
911 Walnut Street Kansas City, Mo. 64106 (816) 374-3796	Iowa Kansas
New Custom House 19th and Stout Streets Denver, Colo. 80202 (303) 297-3091 (Area Office)	Colorado Montana North Dakota
450 Golden Gate Avenue San Francisco, Calif. 94102 (415) 556-7414	Arizona California Trust Territories
Smith Tower Building Seattle, Wash. 98104 (206) 583-7700	Alaska Idaho
	Hawaii Nevada American Samoa
	Oregon Washington

THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS: A REVIEW OF RESEARCH

ED 040279

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR / Manpower Administration
MANPOWER RESEARCH MONOGRAPH NO.13

VT014079

ED 040279

Manpower Research

Monograph No. 13

1970

THE NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS: A REVIEW OF RESEARCH.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL POSITION OR POLICY

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Manpower Administration

PREFACE

This monograph is one of a series being published by the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor on research conducted under title I of the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 and funded by the Department of Labor.

This report reviews research studies on the Neighborhood Youth Corps (responsibility for which was delegated to the Secretary of Labor under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964) to make the findings available to those involved in the planning and administration of the NYC programs. The data may offer information useful not only to the Neighborhood Youth Corps itself but also to youth work-training programs in general, to the extent that problems similar to those discussed are encountered in such programs.

This monograph was written by Marjorie Egloff of the Office of Manpower Research, under the direction of Mary Bedell.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
INTRODUCTION	1
ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS	5
Characteristics of Enrollees	5
Evaluation of NYC by Enrollees	8
The In-School Program	9
The Out-of-School Program	11
REVIEWS OF RESEARCH STUDIES	19
Developing Group Counseling Models	20
Problems and Characteristics of Enrollees	22
Economic Needs of Enrollees	26
Optimizing Benefits for Rural Youth	29
Assessing Effects of NYC	34
Developing Testing Techniques	37
The Out-of-School Program in Houston	38
NYC Experience and Future Employment	41
Effectiveness of Urban Out-of-School Programs	44
Cincinnati's Clerical Co-Op	52
Followup on Terminated Enrollees	54
Measuring Work-Relevant Attitudes	56

INTRODUCTION

In the 5 years since responsibility for the Neighborhood Youth Corps, established under the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, was delegated to the Secretary of Labor, the Manpower Administration of the U.S. Department of Labor has sponsored many research studies to assess NYC projects. The body of that research is reviewed in this report.

The studies have dealt with all three types of programs that comprise the Neighborhood Youth Corps under the terms of the act: The in-school program, which is open to youth still in school and aimed at keeping potential dropouts in school until graduation from high school; the summer program, similarly open to disadvantaged youth to encourage and help them to return to school in the fall; and the out-of-school program, open to youth already out of school with no immediate plans to return, to offer them work experience and/or further training to qualify for permanent jobs. These out-of-school trainees may, at the discretion of the local sponsors and directors, and depending on the availability of resources, be provided special education, training, and supportive services such as counseling, remedial education, and medical attention.

It is seldom possible to determine the chain of cause and effect between research and formulation of policy and program, so it cannot be stated that the studies outlined in this report—which generally cover material of a period not later than 1968—have led directly to changes and modifications in NYC programs. Several of the changes now under consideration by the Department of Labor, probably to take effect by the end of the present fiscal year, are, however, aimed at correction of weaknesses revealed by research. Both the in-school and out-of-school programs will be more directly oriented toward the individual needs of each enrollee. When a

youth enters the program, efforts will be made to discover his areas of need, his interests, and his capabilities, and plans for him will be developed accordingly. Some may need remedial education; others may need intensive counseling; still others may require special help in making adjustments to the program and some may need all kinds of help that the program can offer. These individual needs will be considered in planning the content of each youth's training and experience. After redesign of the program, the out-of-school NYC program will be confined to boys and girls under age 18, whose youth so often bars them from many jobs and for whom, therefore, the experience of working in NYC may be of great help. It will also be possible to orient the program more directly to a return to school, since most of this younger group will have been out of school only a short time.

The 18- to 21-year-olds who need manpower services will be directed to other Department of Labor programs such as skill training under the Manpower Development and Training Act (MDTA),¹ programs, apprenticeship programs, and the Public Service Careers program of public service with a future. Others will be referred to the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS) program which is conducted by the National Alliance of Businessmen in cooperation with the Department of Labor. Thus, a link between NYC's work experience or training and permanent jobs will be provided for the young men and women who have benefited so much

¹ A 1966 Amendment to the Economic Opportunity Act provided incentive for transfer of NYC out-of-school enrollees to MDTA programs by permitting payment of regular adult allowances to such enrollees. Previously, weekly payment had been limited to \$20.

from the NYC. There will be little or no emphasis on work experience as such.

Adjustments will be made in the out-of-school program as the transfer of these training opportunities to other programs is undertaken, while in-school (including summer) enrollment will be increased correspondingly. At the same time, the in-school program will call for more skill content in work experience, especially in the last 2 years of high school. The summer program, for the past 2 years, has been increasingly directed toward finding jobs for enrollees in private industry. Industry representatives have taken an active part in the effort to locate such jobs. These changes will make the NYC programs for those students still in school, as well as for the young dropouts in the out-of-school programs, increasingly the responsibility of the schools.

The thrust of the redesigned NYC programs is in accord with the research findings that the great diversity of abilities, skills, interests, and ambitions among enrollees greatly lessens the effectiveness of a program that does not take such differences into account. The other major link between the program changes and research findings is the greater emphasis on skill training and work experience that is relevant to the jobs which NYC youth will ultimately enter. Thus research findings to date, although they have contributed to the redesign of the program, may have limited relevance to NYC as the redesign is effected. It seems clear, however, that although the research discussed here is directed specifically to the NYC, results and findings have broad application to problems in youth work-training programs in general. Information made available through these studies that concerns the population to be served in any future programs should constitute a major contribution.

The findings presented in this report should be read with several other cautions in mind. Because the research was intended for use in improving the NYC program, the results may appear weighted somewhat on the negative side of the program. Moreover, because it was heavily oriented toward out-of-school programs in urban centers, most of the research describes projects that were serving groups of youth whose problems, as measured by most social and economic indicators, if not more acute than those of any other group in the population, were at least more obvious and perhaps more difficult to overcome. Finally, the studies can in no way be regarded as an evaluation of the success or failure of the NYC program, either in its long-run or short-run effects. Knowledge of the long-run values of NYC is still both tentative and limited. And even judgment of its short-term effects must be based on scattered and incomplete knowledge, since many of the elements of those effects

are not measurable and must in large part be deduced from reported personal experiences and observations.

Recognizing these limitations, the authors of the studies nonetheless support some generalizations about the effectiveness of different features of the NYC program. They have been unanimous in the conclusion that the NYC has been of real benefit to large numbers of underprivileged youth. NYC enrollees, almost without exception, also have been of this opinion. Indeed, even if the NYC had accomplished nothing more than the provision of a small income to the more than 2 million impoverished youth who have entered the NYC since 1965 (and to their families), this would have been no small achievement; neither would the provision of an "aging vat" to help these youth through an especially difficult transition period. While the research discloses many more lasting benefits to the youth themselves, to their families, and to their communities, these must be weighed against any defects which were also disclosed.

— Many of the NYC youth had failed one grade, sometimes two or three, before leaving school—where they had gotten neither the education nor the counseling they needed. Although the NYC gave them a chance to avoid still another failure, it did not generally provide the remedial education and extended counseling which they sorely required.

-- Many had health problems, but medical attention was rarely provided unless the problem was so acute as to interfere with subsequent employment.

— Substantial numbers of enrollees had police records. Although participation in the out-of-school programs reduced the rate at which they accumulated additional charges, it did not usually equip them for jobs that would pay enough to make criminal activity a less attractive source of income.

— Job placement and job development were not integral parts of most of the projects that were studied. However, when these services were actively provided, they proved of great value.

— The out-of-school projects in urban areas were not reaching impoverished white youth in proportion to their numbers, but those who were participating were often more disadvantaged than the Negro participants.

These and other research findings will continue to act as guides in the ongoing redesign of the NYC programs—just as research has, in some part, sparked the changes and improvements which have already occurred or been scheduled. For example, measures are being developed to enable counselors to assess the individual youth's characteristics upon enrollment, which will permit selection of the best training situation for each.

The studies of rural youth show clearly that they need programs directed toward their special problems—some differing from those of urban youth, others similar but more aggravated. In view of the widespread movement of young people from the country to the city, the NYC should help meet the problems of adjustment, which are not covered by rural institutions in preparing these youth to adjust to urban life. Studies of NYC programs in additional rural areas are needed as a guide to designing programs that will serve this purpose.

Meanwhile, for wider use, this analysis brings together in a convenient and usable form the more salient findings of research completed through mid-1969. It consists of two parts: First, a summing up and analysis of the findings of the studies, with primary attention directed to points of agreement, disagreement, or significant elements uncovered by the studies; second, a brief

review of each study, describing the methods of research, the findings, and the authors' suggestions for changes in the program or for further research. Some additional research projects are currently underway.²

² "The Job Supervisor's Role in NYC Programs for Out-of-School Youth," by Mary G. Powers, Gerald M. Shattuck, and Charles Elliott, Fordham University, Bronx, N.Y. (Contract No. 41-7-010-34).

"A Pilot Study on Observational Measurement of Behavioral Factors Associated with Increased Employability of Out-of-School NYC Enrollees," by Richard E. Sykes, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minn. (Contract No. 41-7-008-25).

"Development of Assessment Measures for Counseling Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees," by Norman E. Freeberg and Franklin R. Evans, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J. (Contract No. 41-9-005-34).

"A Study of Negro Male High School Dropouts Who Are Not Reached by Federal Work-Training Programs," by Dr. Regis H. Walther, Social Research Group, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C. (Contract No. 41-9-001-09).

ANALYSIS OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

The research on the Neighborhood Youth Corps which is discussed in this report is diverse in character. The research studies are of necessity limited both in time and in location. Because of the many variables involved, there can be no such thing as a "representative" NYC program. Therefore, it is not possible to say how generally applicable a study of a specific program or a specific area may be. Highly illusive and unmeasurable aspects—project leadership or caliber of personnel, for example—make it impossible to reach an overall conclusion. The need to know how NYC was operating necessitated undertaking some of the research in the very early phases of the program.

The studies can be divided roughly into those which surveyed individual NYC projects or specific elements in those projects, and those of a more experimental nature which attempted to develop and test possible ways to meet some of the problems that became evident as the NYC program matured. For example, one study analyzed problems peculiar to rural youth and the manner in which NYC may best help this group of young people.

Another evolved and tested a system of group counseling. Another set up and tested a program for measurement of work-relevant attitudes. Another, in which some two-thirds of the sample were in rural programs, analyzed characteristics of NYC enrollees and estimated, on the basis of administered tests, their readiness for (or current ability to undertake) further formal education, job training, or employment. Another analyzed the economic needs of the enrollees, and related the ways in which they spent their NYC earnings to those needs. Still others investigated various components of the NYC program, such as occupational training and job development, or remedial education, as they have been developed in certain urban areas.

Despite the diversity of the research studies, and distinctive as are the aims, methods, and objectives of the in-school and the out-of-school NYC programs, some elements appear common to both types of programs and to all of the studies. Such common elements are discussed here before more detailed attention is given to the two different types of programs.

Characteristics of Enrollees³

There was unanimous opinion among the researchers that young men and women enrolling in NYC programs fully met the eligibility requirements set forth in the act. A great majority of enrollees in all programs came from families larger than the average, with incomes often well below the poverty level; they lived in substandard housing, lacking one or more of the common conveniences; their families were frequently on welfare, and many lived in public housing projects; many were from broken homes, most frequently with the father out of

the home; in urban centers the great majority of enrollees were Negro and most were female. In-school enrollees had completed an average of 10 grades in school, while out-of-school enrollees were more frequently found to have completed no more than eight grades; it was common for enrollees to have failed at least one grade, sometimes two or three. A larger

³ See table for detail on the characteristics of youth enrolled in NYC programs.

CHARACTERISTICS OF NEIGHBORHOOD YOUTH CORPS ENROLLEES

[Based on 111,169 enrollee records from Sept. 1, 1968, to May 31, 1969]

Characteristic	In-school (IS)	Out-of-school (OS)	Characteristic	In-school (IS)	Out-of-school (OS)			
Item	Percentage	Percentage	Item	Percentage	Percentage			
Sex								
Male	52.3	45.8	Mos. since leaving school					
Female	47.7	54.2	1-3	-	11.0			
Race								
White	53.8	49.4	4-6	-	14.7			
Negro	41.5	46.4	7-12.	-	24.5			
American Indian	2.0	2.2	13-24.	-	24.3			
Oriental7	.4	25-36.	-	6.4			
Other	2.0	1.6	More than 36.	-	19.1			
Years of age								
15 and under	12.9	.4	1	1.1	5.6			
16	31.0	12.3	2	3.8	9.4			
17	32.3	24.6	3	7.8	12.2			
18	17.3	23.8	4	11.3	11.6			
19	5.0	17.9	5	13.4	11.4			
20-21	1.4	17.8	6	13.4	10.5			
22 and over	(1)	3.3	7	12.3	9.5			
Median: 16.8 (IS); 18.1 (OS)								
Marital status								
Single	99.2	81.7	No. of persons in household					
Married6	12.5	14	4.3			
Separated, widowed, divorced2	5.8	2	4.8	9.5			
Enrollees with children .								
3.3	26.0	5	10.0	13.5				
Draft classification²								
1-A	-	38.1	4	13.5	13.5			
1-Y	-	23.5	5	14.8	12.9			
4-F	-	15.9	6	13.7	11.3			
Other, including veterans	-	22.5	7	12.1	9.5			
School grades completed								
6th or less	1.1	4.6	8 or more	30.7	25.6			
7th	3.9	6.2	Median: 6 (IS); 5 (OS)					
8th	13.2	15.6	Head of household					
9th	22.9	24.0	Enrollee	0	11.3			
10th	30.6	26.1	Father	60.2	33.8			
11th	27.5	19.1	Mother	27.1	23.9			
12th or more ³9	4.3	Other	12.7	31.0			
Median: 10.3 (IS); 10.0 (OS)								
Reasons for leaving school								
Academic	-	91.8	Youth living in public housing	15.0	16.1			
Economic	-	8.2	Family receiving public assistance	32.5	31.6			

Characteristic	In-school (IS)	Out-of-school (OS)
Item	Percentage	Percentage
Youth contributing to family support before NYC	41.5	61.2
Enrollees who had held paying job(s)	50.6	68.3
Time on last paying job		
1-15 hrs./week . . .	26.0	8.8
16-40 hrs./week . . .	68.9	78.3
More than 40 hrs./week	5.1	12.9

Characteristic	In-school (IS)	Out-of-school (OS)
Item	Percentage	Percentage
Hourly earnings on last job		
Less than \$0.50 . . .	1.3	2.0
\$0.50-\$1.00	11.1	14.6
\$1.01-\$1.25	42.3	22.0
\$1.26-\$1.50	29.9	26.3
\$1.51 or more	15.5	35.0

¹Less than 0.05 percent.

²Based only on those reporting a draft classification.

³Not necessarily high school graduates.

proportion of boys than girls had police records, but such records were relatively common to both. In-school enrollees averaged between 17 and 18 years of age, those out-of-school were usually 19 or older on enrollment, with the male enrollee on the average somewhat younger than the female, and with a less favorable school completion record.

Despite the fact that enrollees uniformly met established eligibility standards, there appeared to be some question as to whether the NYC was in fact reaching the most disadvantaged of eligible youth. Few white boys and girls had enrolled in urban NYC programs, and those who had participated in the programs were more disadvantaged than the Negroes—in school work completed, in early dropout, in communication skills, in appearance, and in self-confidence.

The great preponderance of Negro girls in urban programs also raised questions in some researchers' minds as to recruiting methods used or to the program's general appeal. However, since this group has the highest unemployment rate, and finds it more difficult than other youth to locate jobs (even in the lowest status and lowest pay categories), and also is apparently more eager than the young men to enter and stay with the program, the greater number of Negro girls in the urban programs might be looked upon as evidence that the program is actually reaching the most disadvantaged of the target group. One researcher concluded that not only were the most disadvantaged not always sought out, but in some cases they were not wanted in the schools or in the program, and considerable screening of applicants occurred. Whether such screening is detrimental to success of the NYC program was questioned by some of the researchers, who argued that the program would be enhanced by emphasis on the less disadvantaged who could more readily be placed in permanent jobs, could serve as an example to other disadvantaged youth, and would heighten the prestige and appeal of the NYC

program. There were other indications, however, that some of the programs were enrolling youth who suffered from both mental and physical handicaps, as well as from poverty.

A special problem with regard to rural youth was stressed in one study. Family income, it was pointed out, was not as relevant a criterion for eligibility as were other circumstances which affected many rural youth—geographic and cultural isolation, shortage of recreational and cultural facilities, and lack of opportunity for employment or training within the community because of the almost complete absence of industry. A further impediment to using family income as the criterion for eligibility was the reluctance of many rural youth and their families to admit the poverty which made the youth eligible for enrollment.

The character of work assignments available to NYC enrollees varied little between the in-school and out-of-school programs. Under the provisions of the act setting up the program, work assignments were to be in nonprofit agencies (schools, libraries, hospitals, social service, etc.) in work that was needed, but would not replace regular employees. In-school enrollees were, in large part, given work in the schools themselves, while those in the out-of-school programs were in various government, charitable, or religious agencies. In the one cooperative work and training program studied (Cincinnati), the desirability and value of the cooperative work-education approach was clear. It must be remembered that at the time these studies were conducted, the work training in private industry (WTI) provided for in 1966 was not in widespread use; in fact it has not yet affected any considerable number of NYC enrollees. These difficulties will, in part at least, be met by the previously discussed changes in the program to take effect probably in the present fiscal year.

In both types of programs a clear pattern of assignment by sex to worksites was apparent. All the

studies reviewed showed that the preponderant number of male enrollees were engaged in custodial or maintenance work, while work assignments for female enrollees were much more varied and more likely to be in clerical, tutoring, or paraprofessional-aid fields. Although food preparation and serving and other housekeeping jobs were also frequent, they were not the primary source of work experience or training for the young women. Only one city studied (St. Louis, where assignments were limited to hospitals) had any significant number of male enrollees assigned to the professional-aid category.

Some researchers saw in this difference in work assignments the main reason for the program's greater appeal to girls than to boys, as well as for the greater subsequent impact on the girls' work experience. The

work assignments for young women were, in larger part, types that might lead to employment in jobs above the low-status, low-pay jobs which were generally open to them in the job market. The boys' work assignments in maintenance and janitorial work were obviously dead end and could not pave the way for more meaningful and satisfying work after the boys had left NYC. In addition, the work assignments for girls frequently led to contacts with professional people (teachers, librarians, etc.), while the boys were supervised by unskilled and in general poorly educated janitors or maintenance men. This, perhaps as much as the actual type of work assignment, could have a discouraging effect upon the male youth in the program, although many of the boys said that they liked their work.

Evaluation of NYC by Enrollees

Almost universally, enrollees in both the in-school and out-of-school programs felt that their experience had been both helpful and pleasant. A minority were disappointed that NYC had not provided more vocational or skill training and had not led directly into NYC-related permanent employment. Among in-school enrollees there was frequent complaint that earnings were inadequate, and this complaint was also voiced by a minority of out-of-school enrollees. But the overwhelmingly large proportion of participants in both programs found their experience on the plus side, and this is perhaps the best evidence that NYC is, to some degree at least, fulfilling the expectations of the enrollees—if not their aspirations.

Not only did the program as a whole meet with approval by a large proportion of all participants, but personal relations with counselors and supervisors were also found to be generally satisfactory (although experience with counselors was less frequently considered adequate than that with supervisors, partly on the basis that they did not have enough time with their counselors). Relationships with fellow participants appeared on the whole to have been satisfactory. These reactions of enrollees may mean that they expected little of the program except as a "tide over" experience; this, combined with the complaint the NYC did not give them enough money, might indicate that a significant

group of the out-of-school enrollees looked upon NYC as primarily a stopgap or temporary undertaking until better jobs could be found. The very fact that so many left the program after only a few months, and yet still expressed almost complete satisfaction with their experience, would seem to bear out this conclusion. Again, this was an attitude more prevalent among the males than the females, who more frequently saw in the program not only a chance to acquire a skill, but also a chance to bring about upward mobility, both economically and socially. It appears, indeed, that a significant proportion of NYC enrollees, particularly those in the out-of-school program, look upon NYC participation itself as a job rather than as a learning experience. For many it appears that NYC acts as a sheltered work-setting—an alternative to a less satisfying outside job. In other words, it may serve many as a "buffer against prejudices, a competitive work structure, job instability, or the stigma of boy's work."

A study of the economic needs of NYC enrollees showed that the money earned (which was a median of slightly less than \$25 for in-school and about \$75 for out-of-school enrollees every 2 weeks) was spent "responsibly," with the largest single expenditure going for household expenses (utilities or food) or as a contribution to the family, which in turn became household expenses.

The In-School Program

The overriding objective of the NYC program for in-school youth is to keep boys and girls in school until they graduate from high school, by providing them with supplementary income. Money ranked high on the list of reasons for enrollment, but one of the major complaints against the program was that the money furnished was insufficient. Work experience is limited to public or private nonprofit agencies; and work-experience time is limited to not more than 15 hours a week, paid at the legally established minimum wage. Less frequently given as reasons for enrolling in NYC were learning good work habits, learning to get along with people, and gaining work experience as means to a job after graduation.

In-school enrollees learned about the program primarily from fellow students, although teachers and counselors steered many into NYC.

While preventing school dropouts is the principal aim of the in-school program, the effects of NYC participation cannot be measured in this way alone. Success or failure of the program might be reflected in changes in grades, in attitudes toward continued education or future work, in relationships with teachers and fellow-students, in family relationships, or in delinquent behavior. Some of these measures of success or failure might lend themselves to statistical or other evaluation but others can only be guessed at either by researchers or the NYC participants themselves. The studies reviewed provide the best available indications of the effects of NYC participation on the young men and women who have been enrolled in the program.

NYC AND CONTINUED SCHOOL ATTENDANCE

One study indicates belief that the program is meeting its primary objective of delaying or preventing drop-outs. The North Carolina study did not go into detail as to what NYC's effects might be on enrollees, but the authors state that "while there is no way of determining how many of these enrollees would be in school even without the NYC program, the program no doubt makes it easier, and in many cases, perhaps, provides the only means for these young people to continue in school. In this capacity, the NYC program performs a useful and effective function." The authors of this study believe, however, that in-school NYC should not be directed merely toward keeping disadvantaged youth in school. Rather, it should be directed toward providing additional help for the more highly motivated enrollees, who

have a good chance for educational and occupational development beyond high school. For this group, the authors say, NYC might better act as a screening device and contact point to help them, through financial aid, not only to complete high school but to go on to further education or to further training and job placement, through coordination with other organizations.

In one other survey of the in-school program, in Cincinnati and Detroit, enrollees were asked if they had ever considered dropping out of school. More than a third of the Cincinnati and a fifth of the Detroit youth who answered the question affirmatively, but who had not dropped out, said that getting a job in NYC had been responsible for their remaining in school. While the authors concluded that the Neighborhood Youth Corps "was not notably successful in preventing youth from leaving school prematurely," they did find that a somewhat larger number of the control group in Cincinnati (23 percent) had dropped out of school compared with the enrollee group (17.5 percent). Moreover, significantly fewer of the experimental group gave economic reasons (lack of money for clothing and school expenses, need for employment) for dropping out. The study also points out that "it may be unreasonable to expect the Neighborhood Youth Corps—a program which is primarily a job creation and job opportunity experience—to exert any definitive influence on the causes associated with dropping out of school." Thus, while the studies present no statistical evidence that NYC exerts a holding power, there are indications that this may be so.

In any event, whether or not NYC exerts a holding power on high school students, it can be asserted unequivocally that while NYC participants are in school the hardship of continued school attendance is lessened because of increased income. This is, of course, an element of the NYC program which cannot be measured, but information as to the way NYC participants use the money they earn indicates rather clearly that it is so. That NYC participation also has a marked influence on family finances appears clear from the studies that attempted to discover how NYC incomes were spent both by in-school and out-of-school participants. Very few of the enrollees retained all of their earnings for their own use. Significant proportions were given to enrollees' families; more than a third of the income of all NYC participants queried was reported to be going for such essentials as housing, utilities, and food. Clothing ranked second in spending priority. One researcher, who had made a special study of the economic needs of NYC participants, concluded that "if the estimates are even

approximately correct, the benefits are significant in terms of alleviating poverty." Another study, which queried the mothers of enrollees, showed that in their opinion "the money earned in NYC had been a great help to their families," especially in taking care of school expenses and providing the enrollees with clothes.

Evidence seemed clear that NYC participation permitted enrollees to spend more on school expenses and to afford a higher level of participation in school activities. More than half of the enrollees in two cities felt that the money they earned had been of great help in permitting them to stay in school. Since the main reason given by dropouts for leaving school was economic, it appears that the amounts available to NYC participants for school expenses and clothing (the two principal elements of "economic" reasons) did in fact exert considerable holding power on high school students.

Many of the enrollees both in and out of school reported "savings." In many cases such savings were in fact a substitute for credit buying, as money was being saved for clothing, graduation expenses, etc.

While the money earned on NYC assignments may not have a major effect on such needs as better housing (listed as the first concern of participants), it can obviously help to provide better food or improved medical care, as in fact it was found to do. As one study pointed out, when incomes are as low as those of many of the enrollees' families, amounts earned in NYC went a long way toward alleviating some of the effects of poverty.

EFFECT ON SCHOOL PERFORMANCE

Only one study attempted to evaluate the effect of NYC participation on school performance (as expressed in grades earned). Most of the enrollees in Cincinnati and Detroit were in the "general" curriculum, and well over half were either failing or barely passing at the time of the initial interview. Approximately a year after the beginning of the study, school records were consulted to determine whether the enrollees had dropped out of school, graduated, or were still in high school.

Analysis of those records did not indicate that NYC participation had a favorable effect upon scholastic achievement. Nor did the NYC experience appear to change the overall attitude of enrollees toward the school system, toward teachers, or toward future aspirations and expectations. There was, in fact, some indication that NYC enrollees who prior to entering the program had been doing barely passing work in school suffered some impairment in their school work (greater

than that of the comparable control group) during their enrollment. This may be due, the author points out, to the fact that the minimal amount of the time usually spent on homework is even further reduced by the time spent in work experience during enrollment.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIPS

One research project questioned both NYC participants and the control group as to changes which participation in or exclusion from NYC might have made upon their position in the family and in their communities. Almost one-third of the control group felt that exclusion from NYC had made a difference in their lives because of loss of opportunity to gain work experience, to acquire responsibility and to learn to be constructive; because of loss of income which might have been forthcoming; resultant doubt as to their capabilities; and, in a very small number of cases, diminished interest in their educational pursuits. Two-fifths of the parents of youth who had not been accepted in the program believed that their children lost confidence in their own ability, and another fifth considered that their children lost an opportunity to gain work experience and to develop skills.

Nearly all of the youth in the NYC in-school program said that their relationship with their peers had not changed since enrollment in the program, and three-fourths said they were not treated any differently by their families after enrollment. Those who reported a difference in treatment said that their families were proud of them and gave them more responsibility and privileges, and that they were able to contribute to family expenses.

Most mothers of enrollees felt that there had been no noticeable effect on their children. Changes which had occurred were as frequently noted in the control group as in those in the year-round program. Except as measured by police contacts (discussed later), this study made no attempt to evaluate changes in community attitudes toward enrollees, or enrollees' acceptance of a different role in the community.

LENGTH OF TIME IN THE PROGRAM

In-school enrollment in NYC is presumed to last until graduation from high school, unless it is ended by withdrawal from the program or dropout from school.

In general, in-school enrollees spent relatively long periods of time in the NYC compared with those in the out-of-school groups. Many enrollees spent 12 or more months in the program. In two cities enrollees had been in the program on an average of 9 months when they were first interviewed. Mean duration for active participation was slightly longer in both cities for girls than for boys, which appears to be characteristic of overall NYC

enrollment. At the time of the final interview nearly half of the in-school enrollees in both cities had been in the program for a year or more. The principal reason for leaving the program was need for a better job; few left because they did not like their work assignments or because of unsatisfactory relations with counselor or supervisor.

The Out-of-School Program

In contrast to the aims of the in-school NYC program, those of the out-of-school program are complex and directed toward a number of objectives. Partly geared toward encouraging young men and women to return to school if they had not graduated from high school, it is also geared to providing work experience or work training to improve employability, to prepare enrollees to get and hold jobs, or to enlist in other programs for further training. Established as a work-experience program, with work experience to be provided in public and private nonprofit agencies, the program has gradually evolved into one in which skill training is conceived as of prime importance. The work-experience approach, it soon became evident, was ineffective not only because many of the available jobs lacked skill content or training potentiality, but also because jobs in the private job market did not parallel many of those in the agencies using NYC enrollees, for example, hospitals, schools, and social agencies. Thus, even though work assignments might include acceptable skill content, the skills acquired in NYC might prove unusable in the competitive job market.

The evolution toward work training began in 1966 when the Economic Opportunity Act was amended to permit skill training in private industry—the WTI program—and as of the time of the preparation of this report, it has culminated in the limitation of the out-of-school program to 16- and 17-year-old youth.

The program was expected also to include—at the option of the local sponsor and within funds available—supportive services of various kinds. Counseling and remedial education are presumably integral parts of the program, but they vary widely in extent and quality, and are often lacking. Medical attention or specific skill training may or may not be included as part of the program, but in most of the programs studied they were either absent or very sketchy in nature.

Since the in-school and the out-of-school NYC programs differ so widely, judgment as to the value of the two must be based on different criteria. Success of

the out-of-school program can be measured in terms of the change in both quantity and quality of post-NYC employment, by the rate of return to school or entry into training programs, by changes in family and community relationships, or by the aspirations and expectations of the enrollees that may result from NYC participation. Since the generally accepted purpose of the program is to increase the employability of enrollees—through further education, work experience, or skill training—the first and most obvious basis of evaluation would be the success of the program in leading to more and/or better employment opportunities. Only studies carried out over a period of years will make possible definitive judgments.

EFFECT OF NYC ON POST-NYC EMPLOYMENT

If a single answer were necessary to the question of whether NYC has enhanced the employability of its out-of-school enrollees the answer—on the basis of the studies reviewed—would be “yes” for many, if not all. It seems clear that NYC programs in urban centers have been extremely beneficial to young Negro women, of little help to many young Negro men, and of even less benefit to young white men and women. However, when studies similar to those analyzed are available for NYC programs in smaller cities and towns and in rural areas, a totally different picture of NYC effectiveness may emerge.

Whether the program is considered as stopgap employment, as some researchers contend, or as a so-called “aging vat” to see young men and women through the difficult period of transition from school to work, or as a means of upward occupational and social mobility, the studies analyzed seem to indicate that many have benefited from their NYC experience in preparing for and locating jobs.

Another interesting point which seems clear is that young women are much more responsive to the demands of the program than are young men, and they are looked upon by counselors and supervisors much more favorably as being easier to work with and more amenable to discipline and training. Again, this may be due to differences in motivation or in work assignments, to the different attitudes of teachers and counselors themselves, or to the "better" program mapped out for the young women in response to their needs and aspirations. Further study of the design and carrying out of the programs might show clearly that the characteristics of the programs rather than the characteristics of the enrollees may, in part at least, be responsible for the difference in appeal to, and quality of experience in, NYC programs.

Whatever the qualifications, however, the out-of-school NYC program has, upon the evidence presented in the research projects, helped many young men and women to find employment, at wages and under conditions better than they experienced before their NYC participation.

WORK ASSIGNMENTS AND SUPERVISION

Researchers differ as to whether the fact that young women found the NYC so much more attractive and helpful than did young men was because better work assignments were available to them. Some see it rather as a reflection of the young men's use of the NYC largely as a holding operation until they find more attractive jobs, or as a result of the almost universal finding that the male enrollees were younger, less well-prepared, and less definitely motivated than the young women. In view of what is known, however, of the effects of low status, low pay, poor image, "dirty work" type jobs, some of the negative response or lack of enthusiasm of young men to their NYC experience can be attributed to the kind of work assignments they have received. It seems reasonable to suppose that they may readily have become disillusioned with "work experience" which obviously would lead only to dead end, unskilled jobs.

Problems of supervision received only incidental attention in most of the studies analyzed.⁴ The information available, however, indicated that job supervisors were often not only untrained but unsympathetic—if not actually antagonistic—to the demands made upon them. Examples were encountered of supervisors using

⁴ Recognition of their importance is indicated by a study now underway entitled "The Job Supervisor's Role in NYC Programs for Out-of-School Youth," referred to in footnote 2.

demeaning language, refusing to provide work for the enrollees assigned to them, and in other ways showing their unwillingness to undertake their supervisory responsibility. Yet enrollees also frequently considered the work supervisor the most important figure in the NYC program. Since many of the work assignments for young men were in custodial and janitorial work, it was inevitable that these work supervisors would be janitorial or maintenance personnel, men of limited experience and education who were similar to the types of supervisor the enrollees had known in jobs they held before entering the NYC programs. Thus they were unable to meet the need of many youth for "role models" which they lack in their own lives.

From the one study that did analyze the problems of supervision in some detail, it appeared clear that divided supervision was unsatisfactory; that too close supervision aroused resentment, while too lax supervision led to little work and little learning. The most satisfactory supervision occurred where trainees had a set routine of duties and were kept busy at work they felt to be important. It was found that the enrollee's attitude toward the job depended, in large part, on the degree to which he or she was integrated into the agency's informal social organization as well as into the work routine.

LENGTH OF STAY IN NYC

The period of participation in the out-of-school NYC program was expected to be not more than 6 months, unless the enrollee was also engaged in a remedial education or training activity, in which case enrollment could be extended to 2 years.

The survey of out-of-school youth in four urban sites again indicated that the young women stay in the program longer. Large numbers of young men left the program after less than a 3-month enrollment. Their shorter stay appeared due largely to the fact that they found full-time employment much more easily than did the young women. This may explain in part why white youth stay in the program the shortest period of time. They may find it much easier than the Negroes to find other job opportunities, but since the number of white enrollees in the NYC projects studied was so small, comparison of reasons for dropout either by sex or racial group was not possible.

Several researchers point out that early termination does not in every case mean that the NYC experience was a failure. Many young people who enter NYC are already almost employable and need only a little

assistance to find jobs in which they can perform adequately. Others return to school, go into the armed services, or take up vocational training.

Multiple enrollments in NYC were by no means uncommon. This, combined with the large number of out-of-school enrollees who left the program after a short stay, led to the suggestion by one researcher that, once enrolled, a youth should be considered the responsibility of the NYC until it had been established that he could hold down a full-time job, or until the program administrator could provide no further assistance to him. Such a policy, it was emphasized, should be combined with the requirement that an enrollee be permitted to continue in a work assignment only as long as he meets reasonable standards of performance for that job. When he fails to do so, he should be placed on furlough until he decides he is ready to return and to comply with the standards. When he has made this decision and it appears to be sincere, he should be given a new work assignment as soon as possible. Many youth were apparently unable to adjust to the program and were separated because of disciplinary problems, lack of interest, or because they had found a job which, in many cases, they did not keep for long.

PREVIOUS WORK EXPERIENCE

The rather extensive record of employment of enrollees before they entered the NYC raises the question of whether work experience is pertinent for many of them. (It might also raise the question of whether NYC was reaching the most disadvantaged youth.) Obviously, whether they have had jobs or not they already know a great deal about the demands of work, and they frequently view those demands as being more stringent than do either employers or work supervisors. Therefore, prework training appears unnecessary for many. Unskilled and casual work is available to underprivileged youth, but such work contrasts sharply with their expectations regarding the meaning of work. Since the great majority of male NYC enrollees were given work assignments similar to the work they had already done, or could find at any time, such work experience did not, obviously, prepare them for higher-skill, better-pay jobs after they left NYC. In North Carolina, for example, slightly over half of the out-of-school enrollees reported previous work experience, although a large majority reported trouble in finding work. About a fourth of these considered lack of education the reason for their difficulties. Slightly over two-fifths had looked for work by going directly to the

prospective employer; almost half had used the State employment service; and almost a third had relied upon classified advertising. Some reported using more than one means in their job search.

A majority of the trainees in a random sample reported employment previous to NYC enrollment—largely in unskilled laboring jobs, but for the most part in jobs which could be considered normal, adult occupations. Some had worked in factories, in service stations, or on construction. Only a small percentage of surveyed terminated enrollees had not worked before they registered in the NYC. Other researchers indicated that while many enrollees had worked prior to entry into NYC, their jobs had been for the most part casual and could not be considered as having introduced them to the responsibilities of the work world.

ENROLLEE ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

From the information available in the studies analyzed, it appears that NYC enrollees entertain educational and occupational aspirations very similar to those of middle-class youth. How realistic such aspirations are, in terms of educational background, financial resources, jobs available, and so forth, is questionable. Again, there appeared to be a distinct difference between the occupational aspirations of the male and female enrollees. Young women were much more likely to have professional or subprofessional goals. Although a considerable number of young men hoped to become white collar workers, many aspired to jobs as mechanics, craftsmen, or machine operators. Whether the higher aspirations of the young women are partially due to the type of work assignments open to them in NYC cannot be determined on the basis of the data.

In order to make some judgment as to the realistic nature of the occupational goals of the enrollees, supervisors, counselors, and teachers in a number of programs were asked to rate the enrollees on this subject. The great majority of goals were deemed realistic in view of the enrollees' capabilities. Again, however, the young women were rated as more likely to achieve their goals.

The difference between occupational aspirations and expectations was great in almost every case. While considerable proportions of both the young men and women aspired to professional, technical, or managerial work, very few expected to achieve such positions. For example, in one survey none of the young men aspired to farm work, but almost a fourth of them expected that they would perform such work. Over a third of the

young women in the same study aspired to clerical and sales jobs, but less than half believed they would achieve their desires.

The wide difference between aspirations and expectations is explained by one researcher as resulting from the enrollees' feeling of uncertainty in regard to their ambition and the ambivalence revealed by the reasons given for wanting the jobs they mentioned. Similarly, very few were realistic concerning the reasons that might prevent them from getting the kinds of jobs they wanted. Lack of money was given most frequently by all enrollees, while young men, but not young women, assigned high priority to lack of previous employment and educational opportunity. Relatively few listed racial discrimination as something that would bar them from wanted jobs. The authors conclude that (perhaps in common with all youth) enrollees' "aspirations are far superior to their expectations, and enrollees offer neither compelling reasons for their goals nor do they seem cognizant of possible problems preventing them from realizing their ambitions."

POLICE CONTACTS

Of the four urban centers whose NYC programs were surveyed in one research project, a special study of police records was conducted in two (Cincinnati and Durham) to measure the effect of NYC participation on police contacts. About half of the Cincinnati youth had police records, with more boys than girls having such records at the time they enrolled in the program. A substantial decrease occurred in both the experimental and control groups as the youth became older—but the experimental group, which had the higher rate prior to enrollment, had the lower rate after enrollment. The numbers are small, but the most dramatic change occurred in the reduction of police contacts in the female sample (both experimental and control). At the beginning of the study of Durham police contacts, the experimental group contained a significantly greater number with adult (over 16 years of age) police contacts than did the control group. After enrolling in NYC, contacts in the experimental group declined, while in the control group the number rose.

While the differences were small, they showed that the incidence of police contact in both cities was much greater among the young men than the young women, and that a decline in such contacts occurred during NYC participation. The authors warn against drawing any conclusions from the data they present, but remark that "the tendency found in this study for enrollees to be charged with fewer offenses than control subjects is

consistent with the impression of police officials in this and other cities...that the out-of-school NYC program is noticeably decreasing crimes among youth participating in the program."⁵

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES

Unanimous opinion of the researchers is that supportive services, which might have gone a long way toward increasing the effectiveness of the NYC out-of-school program, are either lacking or seriously inadequate.⁶ None of the programs studied had undertaken any kind of comprehensive health services. Remedial education appeared to be a failure except in the Durham project and even that program ultimately ran into difficulties. Counseling was an integral part of all programs but was frequently relegated to professionally untrained personnel or to work supervisors. Many of them were in janitorial or maintenance work, without training or experience in counseling and frequently even without interest in the trainees assigned to them. Active help in finding jobs at completion of the NYC enrollment period was in most cases informal, depending on individual counselors and supervisors. However, one program which had an organized job development program (the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op) was eminently successful in placing its participants in jobs; another (St. Louis), which provided work experience only in hospital worksites, found that many of these jobs became permanent.

Counseling

One study devoted itself to working out a group counseling system and testing it on two groups of NYC enrollees—one in-school and one out-of-school. Although the number of NYC enrollees considered was small, both the advantages and the difficulties involved appeared clear. The counseling undeniably brought about observable and positive effects and the team idea worked well.

⁵ A study of group counseling in Arizona also showed decline in number and seriousness of police contacts, but related this only to the counseling and discussed it under that heading. The one study devoted exclusively to in-school programs concluded that there was no evidence that NYC participation in either Cincinnati or Detroit was related to delinquency prevention or reduction.

⁶ The need for, and importance of, supportive services were recognized early in the program by many persons planning and administering the NYC. Funds made available to the program, however, were so limited that to provide such services would have denied admittance to many youth who applied for enrollment. The decision was to spread funds available to as many disadvantaged youth as possible.

The system appeared to have more effect on the out-of-school than on the in-school enrollees insofar as their attitude to the NYC program itself was concerned. On the other hand, group counseling did not have any measurable effect on actual school performance; nor did it lessen school absences (rather they increased slightly during the counseling period, as compared to the precounseling record). There was, however, a drop in juvenile court referrals for both the in-school and the out-of-school groups—not only did the number of referrals decrease, but the incidents in the pre-NYC period included more serious delinquent behavior such as thefts and carrying of deadly weapons. Counseling could, therefore, be positively related to a reduction in delinquency. This study indicates very clearly that the use of the professional-paraprofessional team can be very effective in group counseling. Especially significant is the fact that regular NYC coordinators, without previous counselor training, were used as the cocounselors in the study.

In all the studies that discuss counseling there is strong evidence that more and better counseling is needed, that it should be more directly involved with enrollee self-improvement (much of it is now apparently directed toward finding jobs or correcting onsite work frictions and problems), and that it be continued beyond the period of enrollment in NYC. For the in-school enrollees this would mean continued interest and counseling while they are in school, which would undoubtedly help keep them there until they graduate. Counseling would also continue with regard to further education or training, adjustment to work (if the young man or woman went directly into a job), advice on how to find a job, etc. For the out-of-school program, counseling would be carried out not only with the NYC enrollee but with his employer or supervisor in the period immediately following placement in a job.

Remedial Education

The research studies reviewed contain little information on remedial education in the NYC programs. For the most part it was either considered a failure or was not an aspect of that part of the program under study. Dependence on the public schools for remedial education has been general, and the schools have apparently offered little that is new or innovative. Many NYC enrollees are dropouts from the same schools to which they are now expected to return, and their suspicion and dislike of the traditional educational program is noted in a number of cases. Also mentioned more than once is the attitude of many social administrators and teachers.

They do not want the disadvantaged youth, especially the boys, in the schools and in many cases had encouraged them to drop out. None of the studies discussed here was directed toward indepth investigation of the kind of remedial education offered, or toward the effects such education had on its recipients. However, one study revealed that an innovative remedial education program in Durham was attracting and holding some of the young male dropouts who were, generally, much opposed to continuing their education. In that program, small evening classes were held in churches and community centers. Another attempt at remedial education was tried in Pittsburgh, where the regular school system was used. Although both efforts appeared promising, each ran into difficulties (changes in personnel, lack of funds, etc.)—and an accelerated learning experiment was instituted in three cities (St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh). Criteria for an “ideal” situation were provided, and teachers from the three cities were brought to Pittsburgh for training by a Job Corps trainer in the use of Job Corps materials. A preliminary report on the results of this experiment is given later in this publication.

Health Care

While physical examinations and remedial or preventive health care programs may be in effect in some NYC programs, the studies reviewed here do not indicate this.⁷ In one program, in Houston, the Public Health Service was enlisted for physical examinations of enrollees, and later, on its own initiative, it established classes in weight control, nutrition, and home economics for the enrollees.

One of the specific and prevalent health problems encountered by the researchers was lack of dental care; many of the NYC enrollees had never visited a dentist. Also many were found to be suffering from defective eyesight. However, since no medical examinations were given, information about these needs came from the enrollees themselves who thought that, generally, they were in good health.

Job Development

Like counseling, some form of job development—or at least job placement—formed a part of every NYC program studied. But with one exception, in Cincinnati,

⁷ The importance of health care was recognized at the Federal level in the early phases of the program but lack of funds precluded its inclusion in the services offered.

job development or job placement efforts were informal and depended on the efforts of individual program directors, supervisors, or counselors. Many of these made a great effort to place NYC enrollees in jobs and were often successful, but planned, coordinated, directed efforts toward job development were lacking. The responses from NYC enrollees who had found employment often indicated that they had used the same means they used in coming into the NYC itself—relatives, friends, or word of mouth. Special agencies established by the employment service, such as the Youth Opportunity Centers (YOC's), apparently had been little used. The one study directed specifically to job development, that of the Clerical Co-Op Service in Cincinnati, appears to offer conclusive evidence of what can be accomplished in this direction. The success of Cincinnati's job development program, as well as that of the group counseling program in Arizona, appears to indicate clearly that whenever a program is specially designed to achieve a specific result it is far more successful than the usual rather generalized program.

TESTING AS A MEANS OF MAKING NYC MORE EFFECTIVE

While it is very clear that NYC enrollees share many characteristics and suffer the same deprivations and disadvantages, it is equally clear that great diversity exists within the NYC population. Some NYC enrollees are highly motivated, have gone much further in school than others, have well-defined goals, and need only a little help to become fully employable and effective in their jobs. Others are seemingly without motivation, have dropped out of school at the sixth or seventh grade level, and suffer from obvious physical or mental handicaps, and need rehabilitative services of many kinds, including basic remedial education.

From the research studies reviewed, it appears that little, if any, organized or formal attempt has been made to adapt the NYC program to cope with the varying problems, needs, interests, and aspirations of the enrollees. If the NYC is to be of maximum help, it would seem obvious that when a young man or woman enrolls in the program his particular problems should be studied; then his work assignments, counseling, further education, or other supportive services should be based on that analysis. It is equally obvious, however, that any program which deals with such large numbers of people, with such diversity of abilities and problems, cannot be tailored to each individual's needs. It would seem, nonetheless, from a number of the research studies, that

it is feasible to screen enrollees on the basis of interest and abilities, thus enabling them to make better use of their NYC experience.

One of the studies reviewed attempted, by means of a series of tests, to identify those NYC enrollees who were either educable, trainable, marginally trainable, or who obviously needed help of various kinds before they could be considered able to benefit from further education or training. The educable were those capable of finishing high school and/or doing at least some college work if the necessary financial help were available. Those who were functioning at the seventh or eighth grade level, but whose clerical and manipulative aptitudes would enable them to function in a variety of skilled and semi-skilled blue- or white-collar jobs, were considered trainable if they received the needed training and remedial education. The marginally trainable were those functioning at fourth or fifth grade level, but who had the aptitude for low-skilled jobs. Remaining were almost a third (29 percent) of the enrollees who did not meet minimum aptitude requirements for any of 36 Occupational Aptitude Patterns and were therefore considered employable only in very low-skilled jobs such as porter or farm laborer.

The authors say categorically that the results of their study must not be considered as rigid but should be looked upon as measures of achievement to date—what these young men and women might expect if they went into the present job market. They emphasize also that such testing and classification of NYC enrollees as they have attempted would enable sufficient diversification to better meet the needs of the different groups. Those who are found to be only marginally trainable and those with abilities and aptitudes for only the lowest skilled jobs obviously are in need of major rehabilitation, including motivational training, intensive counseling, remedial education, and job training. On the other hand, those capable not only of finishing high school but of going on to further education need financial help and the help that other programs, such as Upward Bound, offer.

A second study of the use of diagnostic testing represents a feasibility phase in the development and application of a battery of tests suitable for guidance and counseling of disadvantaged youth. Tests were devised to compensate for deficiencies in the tests now available, and suitable for use with youth whose verbal levels are low—in some cases using pictorial rather than verbal presentation.⁸

⁸ This work is being carried further under a second contract. It should be noted, also, that the U.S. Training and Employment Service (formerly the U.S. Employment Service) has, for a number of years, been working on culture-fair tests.

A somewhat different approach to establishing a more flexible NYC program proposes broad strategies of "program mixes," which would apply the aspects of the program specifically needed by the individual. Three broad general areas of deficiency are delineated—lack of opportunity, rebellious attitude toward authority, and low self-esteem.

In the first area, many NYC enrollees suffer because of an educational system that has not met their individual needs, or because of family problems or other situations beyond their control which prevent them from making much use of their abilities. One such liability prevalent among young women in NYC programs is pregnancy; another is the need for help in family support and child care.

The second area of deficiency results from a rebellious attitude toward authority. Rebellious youth find it difficult, if not impossible, to adjust to the demands of school or job. Before they are ready to remain and succeed in employment, their attitude must be changed. The authors suggest that counseling is most important for this group. Counselors should interpret both the role of the youth and of his supervisor. Group counseling could be effective as the rebel is usually more willing to listen to his peers than to adults in positions of authority. For this group, the authors believe, the "program mix" should be a combination of work

experience and different forms of counseling. This type of youth, they say, is not yet ready to accept remedial education.

The third area of deficiency, the low self-esteem in which many NYC enrollees hold themselves, leads them to doubt their capabilities and, on the basis of failures in the past, to believe that their efforts are doomed to lead only to further failures. The authors suggest that this type of youth needs sheltered work experience with supervisors who are sympathetic and do not make demands upon him which he cannot meet, but at the same time expect him to perform well at his present level. Counseling at this stage should be directed toward helping the youth recognize his progress and achievements and thus build his self-confidence.

Those three major groups are divided by the authors into a number of subgroups, and varying program strategies are recommended.

The authors contend that at the time a youth enrolls in the NYC project he should be classified according to his type—on the basis of his own responses to tests and the interviewers' recommendations. Then a program should be prepared outlining a strategy for meeting his needs, such as counseling, desirable work experience, and remediation. The authors undertook the development of a measure of work-relevant attitudes, which is discussed in the following section of this report.

REVIEWS OF RESEARCH STUDIES

The following brief reviews of the research studies on the Neighborhood Youth Corps indicate only the major outlines and findings of the studies. Copies of the reports may be obtained from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific and Technical Information, Springfield, Va. 22151 for \$3 each (paper) and 65 cents (microfilm).

The studies reviewed here by no means cover all the research that has been done on the Neighborhood Youth Corps, either by Government agencies or by individuals. As previously stated, the research here reviewed is that for which the Department of Labor, through its Manpower Administration's research program, has been responsible.

18/19

Developing Group Counseling Models

Developing Group Counseling Models for the Neighborhood Youth Corps by Calvin Daane, Robert Gold, Patrick McGreevy, Wayne Maes, and Donald Kenoyer, Arizona State University, Tempe, Ariz., January 1969 (Contract No. 41-7-005-3).

The first phase of this study was a survey of selected Neighborhood Youth Corps projects around the country, based on interviews with both project personnel and enrollees, to determine the kind and amount of counseling available. At the same time, an extensive survey of the literature dealing with NYC population groups was conducted, to identify as clearly as possible the groups for which group counseling methods, or models, were to be developed. The conclusions reached from these initial studies were that NYC youth were disproportionately beset by problems of coping with authority, communication skills, pessimism-optimism vascillation, and environmental independence versus psychological dependence. Little professional counseling was available, and the counseling which had been attempted was largely unrealistic and unrelated to the community's social and economic organization, to which NYC enrollees would be expected to adjust. Counselors were usually untrained, and counseling procedures appeared unrelated to the promotion of enrollee growth. The purposes of the counseling seemed unclear, and it was abundantly apparent that professional counseling, with clear goals for enrollee improvement, was urgently needed.

Accordingly, a counseling rationale was developed which blended behavioral and existential concepts. It was believed that behavior conditioning, within a group framework designed to encourage free expression of inner feelings, would provide the best opportunity for personal growth of the enrollees.

NYC programs in Albuquerque and Phoenix were selected for the experiment, with a total sample of 243 youth. The Phoenix project studied 131 out-of-school enrollees, all of whom were public school dropouts; in Albuquerque, the study involved 112 in-school enrollees who were working 10 hours a week. Control groups were set up in each city, randomly selected in the same

fashion as the experimental groups; in Phoenix on the basis of population areas in both southern and northern sections of the "inner city," and in Albuquerque on the basis of early and late school dismissals. One control group was given supervised special self-instruction in reading and arithmetic; the other was given no special assistance of any kind.

Data were gathered by means of (1) before and after testing for estimates of change following 2 months of counseling; (2) comparison of total enrollee behavior between a period 2 months prior to counseling and during the counseling period; (3) comparison of verbal behavior during the period before counseling and during counseling; (4) a comparative verbal analysis between models, and (5) counselors' evaluation and report of satisfaction with the various models developed.

Five types of experimental counseling groups and two control groups were set up. Enrollees in the experimental groups were counseled for 32 hours over an 8-week period. The counseling sessions, 2 hours each and twice a week, were conducted by teams made up of a professional counselor and a regularly employed NYC project coordinator. The teams underwent 3 weeks of intensive training in conducting the models. The following counseling models were developed:

Interpersonal Model—identifying problems as situations, verbal expression of self awareness and the projected expectations of environment—"I do", "they expect."

Problem Identification Model—role playing of problem situations, awareness of self-behavior and projection through switching roles, and empathic understanding of roles as they are performed in perceived problem situations.

Intrapersonal Model—awareness of self and self-aspirations, the "me" and "not me" and "wanted me" of self-concept.

Perceptual Modification Model—expanding perceptions of self, significant others, and authority figures in order to include increased positive elements.

Relationship Model—reinforced social imitation of a proposed (ideal) style of communication which includes listening, direct responding, and increased use of “complete messages” (statements that link together content, feeling, and related motive or intent).

Although each model had a separate focus, the same basic counseling techniques were used by the counseling teams in all models, and were developed from dynamic and behavioral learning concepts. The techniques included instruction (task prescription), selective responding (operant conditioning), modeling (social imitation), and “other-rapport” statements (free insight).

The findings indicate that NYC enrollees can benefit from behavior modification through counseling in a group setting. Improvements in social behavior and employability, as well as reduction in police contacts were noted. In-school enrollees showed more gains in expanded perception; out-of-school enrollees improved most in attitudes toward the NYC program, work, and fellow-workers. Some models were more successful than others. The Intrapersonal, Problem Identification, and Perceptual Modification models were superior in many

respects and called for rather highly organized sets of behaviors which minimally trained counselors might readily learn.

Group counseling appeared to have no effect on actual school performance, as shown by grade point averages of in-school enrollees. There seemed to be a slight but significant decrease in school attendance, as well as an increase in number of youth sent to the principal's office for discipline. On the other hand, counseling did appear to have significant effect in reducing delinquent behavior as shown by police contacts.

The study shows that the professional-paraprofessional team was very effective in group counseling. This finding is especially significant since regular NYC coordinators, who for the most part lack professional counselor training, were used as cocounselors in the study. There was, also, greater rapport developed between counselors and enrollees. As the report states, “Mutual support, as the weeks went on, seemed to ‘cut across’ variables of race, economic condition, age, value system, and personal problems. This was perhaps the most ‘heart warming’ of all subjective observations as they were reported from the counselor-control meetings and the tape analysis of sessions.”

Problems and Characteristics of Enrollees

A Comprehensive Assessment of the Problems and Characteristics of the Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees: A Pilot Investigation by William C. Eckerman, Eva K. Gerstel, and Richard B. Williams, Research Triangle Institute, Durham, N.C., March 1969 (Contract No. 81-35-67-01).

This study undertakes a comprehensive assessment of the problems, characteristics, and potentials of both in-school and out-of-school NYC enrollees in North Carolina in order to ascertain the types of assistance these young people require for further development. Specific objectives were to (1) develop a methodology by which to identify and assess the problems faced by NYC enrollees; (2) establish a method for classifying enrollees by problem area; (3) formulate and examine a set of hypotheses related to the problems; and (4) develop procedure for the collection and analysis of information necessary for the establishment of programs to meet the needs of the enrollees. Enrollees were classified by estimated degree of their readiness for further formal education, job training, or employment, and estimated potential for their further development.

Probability sampling (which permitted application of the derived data to all North Carolina NYC enrollees) was used to select a total of 202 enrollees, roughly divided between urban and rural, in-school and out-of-school projects. At the time of sample selection, approximately 1,250 youth were enrolled in each of the urban programs (in-school and out-of-school), with much larger numbers in the rural projects (3,365 in the in-school and 1,225 in the out-of-school projects). While males and females were approximately equal in number in the rural in-school projects, the latter were much more numerous in both types of urban programs (in urban out-of-school programs only 6 percent of the enrollees were male).

The techniques selected for the study were designed to measure occupational aptitudes, proficiency in basic school subjects, interest, and achievement motivation, along with a number of scales dealing with occupational and educational values and expectations. (The tests used were the General Aptitude Test Battery (GATB) developed by the U.S. Employment Service; The Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) distributed by the Guidance

Association of Wilmington, Del.; The Kuder General Interest Survey from Science Research Associates, Inc., Chicago, Ill.; and the Achievement Risk Preference Scale (ARPS) developed at the University of Michigan). In addition, an indepth interview with enrollees included questions on their background, family relations, educational achievements, health and general well-being. As an outside validation measure, former teachers of the enrollees and NYC work supervisors were queried on enrollees' performance in school and on the job.

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF ENROLLEES

Two-thirds of all enrollees were in rural programs. The NYC program in North Carolina appears to attract and hold more female than male and more Negro than white enrollees; only 38 percent of the enrollees were male (25 percent of the out-of-school program) and 66 percent were Negro—in a State where over two-thirds of the poor are white. Although only 26 percent of the female out-of-school enrollees were married, 55 percent of them had children. The female enrollees were, generally, somewhat older than the males. About one-fifth of all enrollees lived in severely crowded homes; more than one-half in deteriorating neighborhoods, in homes lacking one or more of the most common conveniences. In general, enrollees came from larger than average families—about one-third had eight or more siblings. Approximately one-third grew up without a father in the home. The out-of-school enrollees were found to be more deprived than the in-school.

The NYC provided the first continuous work experience for almost half of the enrollees, although most had tried to find work before enrolling. A small number had worked at odd jobs (baby sitting, etc.), while some had worked for short periods (an average of 11 weeks, on

two jobs). Age was most frequently given as the reason for failure to find work.

More than three-fourths of the in-school enrollees were in senior high school, with 44 percent in the 12th grade. In contrast, most of the male and a fourth of the female out-of-school enrollees had completed only the eighth grade or less. Most had dropped out of school at age 16. Although, on the average, enrollees had surpassed their parents' school achievements, 60 percent of the out-of-school young men had only an eighth grade education or less, and only 8 percent of the young women and one of the young men had graduated from high school. Over half of the out-of-school enrollees had failed a grade or more, with "lack of interest" given most frequently as the reason for such failure. This was also the reason given most often by the young men for dropping out of school, while almost half of the young women had dropped out because of pregnancy.

Health of the enrollees was considered generally good, although since no medical examinations were given this evaluation was based on the enrollee's own opinion and on teacher rating. Dental care was generally lacking, and defective eyesight was frequently mentioned.

EDUCATIONAL AND JOB ASPIRATIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

In general the attitudes of the enrollees toward continuing high school and going on to college were similar to those held by young people in general. Continued education was valued because it would lead to better jobs. However, while the enrollees tended to subscribe to the normally prevalent attitudes in regard to continuing education, their own ambitions were far lower. That is to say, their generalized attitudes greatly exceeded their personal aspirations which, in turn, far exceeded their personal expectations. For example, almost all enrollees thought that when given a chance, a boy or girl should complete high school rather than take a job at age 16. Nine out of 10 also said they would like to get a high school diploma or more. But actually one-fifth of the in-school enrollees did not expect to finish high school. And among dropouts this figure was almost one-half for girls and two-thirds for boys.

The same was true for occupational aspirations and expectations. Two-thirds preferred white-collar occupations although fewer than half of them expected to achieve this (most of the latter were still in school).

Forty percent of the male dropouts would have liked to be working in machine trade occupations, but none expected to achieve this. On the other hand, none wanted farmwork, but almost one-fourth thought they would work in farming occupations. Three-fourths of the female dropouts would have liked white-collar jobs, but less than one-fourth thought this was possible—about 40 percent expected to do service work instead. Lack of money was the most frequently given reason for the discrepancy between expectation and aspiration. The out-of-school enrollees were considerably below those in the in-school program in both educational and occupational aspirations and expectations.

While more privileged youth usually have role models in their immediate environment—father, mother, other relatives, or family friends—underprivileged youth are unlikely to know successful persons who might serve as models. Thus they must look beyond their immediate circle for guidance. Out-of-school enrollees had received little encouragement from anyone to return to, or stay in, school. When asked whether they wished to be like father or mother, the identification was closer to the mother than the father, but most wished to be like neither. Parents were not considered a reliable source of advice "when in trouble" nor helpful in suggestions about the type of work enrollees might aspire to getting. More than one-third of the young men and one-half of the young women "never" turned to their fathers for advice of any kind. Yet there appeared to be few other sources of motivation—neither other family members or other adults were often consulted. While girls frequently talked to their peers when in need of support, boys seemed to lack any male support. Alienation was greater among out-of-school enrollees; they listed even fewer persons with whom they would identify, and the young men were the most isolated.

OCCUPATIONAL APTITUDES AND ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

One of the major objectives of this study was to evolve a system by which enrollees could be classified according to identifiable problem areas. On the basis of the study enrollees were classified as educable, trainable, or employable. Classification is of some help in estimating where primary emphasis—and allocation of NYC resources—should be placed. In addition to the individual characteristics of the enrollees themselves, external conditions which might assist or impede their development must be considered.

NYC enrollees classified as educable (21 percent of the total) were assumed to have a good chance of completing high school (given a reasonable amount of assistance from NYC)—5 percent were considered material for a professional or 4-year college, 7 percent for a 2-year college, and 9 percent for completion of high school. On an aptitude and academic basis alone, then, all such enrollees in North Carolina should be encouraged to continue their formal education on one level or another. But this does not take into consideration other possible serious barriers which might prevent such enrollees from continuing their education.

Those classified as trainable (36 percent) or marginally trainable (14 percent) indicated sufficient skills on various aptitude measures to exceed occupational norms for one or more of the occupations in the GATB tests, which had been classified into 36 Occupational Aptitude Patterns. The marginally trainable passed the requirements for fewer jobs than the trainable and produced scores on the WRAT test indicating less than sixth-grade proficiency in basic school subjects. It is highly possible that the group designated as trainable could profit from remedial education, thus making the marginals more trainable and readying the trainable for further formal education, some possibly to the point of finishing high school. However, the fact that even the trainable function from four to six grades below their age level on basic school subjects may make them better candidates for manpower training than for remedial education programs.

Those designated as employable also consisted of two subgroups: One with scores exceeding the skill requirements of a very few low level jobs (14 percent), and the other with scores falling below the minimum standards established for any jobs under the GATB classification system (15 percent). Both of these groups function below the sixth-grade level in basic school subjects. Such enrollees require major assistance before they are ready for employment in anything but the very lowest level occupations.

This classification system is not designed, according to the authors, as a means of assigning any individual to one kind of assistance or another. It is, rather, an attempt to assess the magnitude of the problem in an entire State, as a step toward providing appropriate measures for meeting those problems.

MOTIVATION, INTERESTS, AND BASIC OUTLOOKS

While the tentative classifications discussed above were based on a number of aptitude and academic performance tests, other important factors are involved

which may determine the progress an individual makes toward assuming a productive role in society. Several measures of interests, motivation, and basic outlook were therefore included in the tests administered to the NYC enrollees. Answers to the questions showed that higher skill enrollees also ranked higher on attitudinal and motivational measures.

Enrollees who have proceeded further in formal education and score higher on aptitude and academic achievement tests apparently indicated a philosophy of life which may be highly instrumental in their upward mobility. They seemed to have accepted the values of the middle class. Those classified as capable of continuing their formal education, and to some extent the highly trainable, tended to take a more active, positive approach to life than the rest. They were more optimistic about the future and felt that they have more control over their own destiny. They tended to have more trust in human relationships, yet were willing to forego extended family relationships for opportunities elsewhere. They were also more likely to take positive action leading to better performance. Teachers, counselors, and NYC work supervisors all rated these enrollees as being less inclined to laziness, more thorough in their work, and better all-around students and employees.

The lower skilled enrollees not only seemed to lack the necessary attitudinal orientation toward upgrading themselves, but they apparently were not even making the effort required by the NYC-provided job. They were taking few positive steps toward advancement. These enrollees had to contend with difficulties over and above the problem of low skills and inadequate schooling. Their negative outlook presented a major problem in considering measures that could help them help themselves. It was not possible to determine whether these attitudinal differences were the basic cause of their lower level efforts both in school and on the job, or whether their attitudes reflected recognition of their own inadequacies. It still can be said, however, that programs designed to help the very low-skill NYC enrollees studied will have not only the problem of upgrading skill levels but also of changing attitudes. And changing attitudes may well require attention before skills can be upgraded.

ENROLLEES' COMMENTS ON NYC

Asked to comment on the program, the enrollees almost universally replied that the NYC had helped them, and that they believed they were doing well in the program. Those in the in-school program thought the

best thing about it was "money," with 20 percent suggesting more hours or more pay. On the other hand, work experience leading to employability held first place among out-of-school enrollees. The authors warn, however, that the favorable attitudes expressed by the enrollees must be considered in light of the fact that NYC personnel had helped arrange the interview appointments (although they were neither present during interviews nor did they have access to the answers). Greater anonymity might well have elicited somewhat different replies.

Most of the jobs provided the male enrollees were of the maintenance variety. Although a great many of the female enrollees worked in food preparation or similar occupations, some had opportunities to learn clerical skills—typing, filing, teacher aid, nurse aid, or library assistant. There was no attempt to match enrollee skills with kind of job provided, and the majority of enrollees were having little or no contact with skill-learning jobs.

The fact that the NYC program in North Carolina is so heavily weighted in favor of Negro enrollees and of females raises questions as to the procedures followed in recruiting and in publicizing the program. In a State where 62 percent of its families with incomes under \$3,000 are white, why are 66 percent of NYC enrollees Negro? Similarly, why does the program not attract more and better qualified young men? Of all enrollees, 38 percent are male, and the male enrollees accounted for 66 percent of those rated as only marginally employable.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The authors recommend that every NYC program undertake a testing program similar to that developed for the purposes of this study. The great diversity of skills found among NYC enrollees makes a uniform program design inadequate. The only way to tailor a program to the needs of the enrollees is to measure the requirements of each. A carefully designed and supervised testing plan seems essential. A "culture-fair" test could be used most effectively to determine the aptitudes of NYC enrollees.

The development of a testing procedure is considered by the authors to be but one of the ways in which more guidance from the national office of the NYC should be developed. Feedback from evaluation studies to NYC directors would help to provide guidelines.

Followup after completion of the NYC program should be directed, in part at least, to guiding the terminated enrollees into other programs that might be of value to them, such as Upward Bound, MDTA training, etc. Follow-through after job placement also would be of great help to many of them in facilitating their adjustment to work.

Remedial education is at the option of the local program. It should be a definite requirement in connection with each program.

At the time this study was undertaken, work training in industry had not been developed to any degree. Greater emphasis has since been placed on this phase of the NYC program. This was another recommendation made by the authors. Since a high degree of motivation and perseverance was a characteristic of the enrollees who showed progress in the program, motivational training programs for the more poorly functioning of local programs would appear to be called for, at least on an experimental basis.

Since this study indicated a great need for rehabilitative programs, the authors recommend that such programs be developed on an experimental basis, to test whether the rehabilitation needed by many enrollees is within the capacity of the NYC program.

The vast majority of jobs provided for NYC enrollees in North Carolina were of a low status nature, particularly for males, for whom the program appears to be least successful. Higher skill level jobs should be provided, with supervision that will provide the enrollee with an example of successful occupational achievement—so often lacking among the enrollees' families and associates.

In North Carolina, and perhaps in other programs, it would appear that an investigation of the types of eligible young people who do not enroll in NYC might be helpful in redirecting the program. The preponderance of young women, especially Negroes, may be perpetuating the family pattern of households headed by women, if not actually encouraging it. Reasons for the imbalances noted in the program might lead to corrective action and make it possible to reach a more representative cross section of underprivileged youth.

In view of the large number of female enrollees who were mothers of young children, provision for child care would permit many to pursue further schooling or to seek full-time work.

Economic Needs of Enrollees

The Economic Needs of Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees by Leonard H. Goodman and Thelma D. Myint, Bureau of Social Science Research, Inc., Washington, D.C., August 1969 (Contract No. 41-7007-9).

This study of certain aspects of the economic behavior of NYC enrollees is based on personal interviews with a stratified sample of 2,019 enrollees in 42 urban and rural locations, representing all geographic areas of the United States. The personal characteristics of the youth in the sample correspond closely to those of the national enrollment in NYC as of the period between September 1, 1967, and May 31, 1968. The sample also reflects the geographic distribution of the national enrollment as well as the division between the in-school and out-of-school programs. For purposes of comparison, the survey also included a sample of 518 youth who had been found eligible for admission to the in-school NYC program, but who had not yet been accepted into the program when they were interviewed.

A number of NYC directors were also interviewed, and officials at most of the schools attended by the in-school youth in the sample supplied information on the schools' characteristics—urban or rural, size of enrollment, dropout rate, various costs connected with attendance, degree of racial integration, estimated family income, etc.

Study objectives were to (1) ascertain the economic needs of NYC enrollees; (2) measure the extent to which these needs are satisfied through the NYC programs; (3) identify the conditions under which the needs are satisfied; and (4) provide some basis for assessing the adequacy of NYC policies regarding employment and remuneration of enrollees, in relation to the goals of the program. Prior to this survey, a pilot study was conducted to explore some of the methodology problems anticipated in the national study. In part, this consisted of intensive interviews with NYC enrollees regarding their possessions and their needs. The results obtained provided a basis for the development of the questionnaire used in this survey.

NYC enrollees interviewed were characterized by poverty, poor housing, overcrowding, lack of common

conveniences, high rates of unemployment, absent parents, and so on. One out of every four households included no wage earner but the respondent, and in another 15 percent there were only sporadic and part-time workers. The in-school program, more concentrated in smaller and rural communities, was more evenly divided between white and Negro, while the out-of-school program, concentrated in cities of over 100,000 population, was heavily weighted by the Negro female.

Over a 2-year period the NYC was a significant, if not preeminent, source of income for the enrollees; and for the great majority (88 percent) it was the principal and frequently the only source. In-school enrollees made a median income of slightly less than \$25; out-of-school enrollees, a median of about \$75 every 2 weeks. In-school enrollees of the lowest socio-economic situation group (SES) were more likely than those of higher family SES to supplement their income through additional jobs, usually for only a few hours a week. Working spouses supplemented the income of almost one-fifth of the married enrollees.

What does the NYC enrollee do with the income? The predominant finding was that it is spent "responsibly" or at least in a manner closely resembling adult spending patterns. The largest single expenditure was for household maintenance, either direct payment for housing, utilities, and food, or as a contribution to the family, which then spent it on similar items. Clothing was second in importance. Relatively small sums were spent on recreation or luxury items, and a very small fraction of this luxury item went for tobacco or alcoholic beverages, regardless of income level. Among in-school enrollees, fairly large proportions of NYC income went to meet educational expenses. (See table following.)

Variations in spending were found to be influenced principally by (1) the absolute amount of income—the higher the income, the greater the amount spent on

PROPORTIONS OF NET INCOME EXPENDED ON VARIOUS CATEGORIES AND SELECTED PRIORITY

Expense categories	Average		In-school		Out-of-school	
	Percent of income	Rank	Percent of income	Rank	Percent of income	Rank
Household expenses and/or contribution to parents	28.3	1	24.3	1	31.8	1
Clothing	14.0	2	16.7	2	11.8	2
Food outside home	10.9	3	11.3	3	9.2	3
Transportation	7.4	5	6.4	6	8.3	4
Personal possessions	5.9	6	3.9	9.5	7.6	6
Personal care	4.8	9	5.5	7	4.2	8
Savings and insurance	8.3	4	9.5	4	7.3	7
Entertainment	5.4	7.5	7.8	5	3.5	9
Tobacco and alcohol	1.8	13	1.3	13	2.2	11
Education.	2.5	12	4.4	8	0.9	13
Medical and dental	2.6	11	2.3	12	3.1	10
Gifts and charitable contributions.	2.9	10	3.9	9.5	2.1	12
Miscellaneous	5.4	7.5	2.6	11	7.9	5
Total	100.2		99.9		99.9	

household needs and child care, while those with lower incomes spent proportionately more on education, clothing, and personal care; (2) the sex-typed, social activity pattern—boys spent proportionately more than girls on entertainment and transportation, while girls spent more on personal care; (3) the regional (north-south, urban-rural) pattern—in the South, where enrolments included smaller proportions of females and more rural participants, and where family and community economic levels were lower, enrollees tended to spend more on transportation and gifts and lower proportions on household expenses, contributions to families, entertainment, and meals away from home, and they also tended to save more; in the North, where a larger number were female, the enrollees were more likely to reside in urban areas, their family socio-economic situation was higher, and they contributed more to their families and paid more in household costs and entertainment.

Details of school-related costs were obtained both from the officials of the schools which enrollees attended and from the enrollees themselves. In a majority of cases estimates by school officials were higher than those reported by enrollees, but differences were small. These school-related costs were not insignificant. In only five of the 61 schools annual costs per student averaged under \$30, while in 12 schools they exceeded \$100. Expenses included such items as class dues, tuition, charges for textbooks, supplementary materials and special courses, library, gym and locker fees, and

graduation expenses. The majority of "special courses" were vocational in nature—principally agriculture, business, and home economics.

School costs varied by grade level, region, and family income. The lower the grade, the lower the costs. Marked increases occurred in the 11th and 12th grades to meet the greater school and social demands of those years, such as yearbooks, class ring or pin, or class party. They were higher on the west coast, in New England, and in the Midwest; lower in rural areas; and higher in schools in more affluent neighborhoods. The median for the entire sample was \$80 per year.

There is substantial evidence that NYC participation has greatly facilitated the enrollees' ability to meet these various expenses. The inability to meet them is frequently the major reason for dropping out of high school. Over a third of the out-of-school enrollees in the study said that they left school for economic reasons, either to work or because they could not afford to pay for school expenses and school clothes. Almost half of these youth (18 percent of the entire sample) specifically said that their inability to buy proper clothes was their reason for leaving school. Therefore, according to the authors, buying clothes by the in-school enrollees may well be interpreted as a part of student expense that the youth have been able to meet through NYC participation.

Although NYC had undoubtedly made it possible for in-school youth to participate more fully in extra-curricular activities, the extent of such participation was no

higher for the NYC enrollees than for the comparison group. The reason, the authors conclude, was lack of time rather than lack of money for the NYC youth. It did not appear that either the educational or vocational aspirations of enrollees, which were high, were substantially increased by NYC experience. There were indications that the aspirations of the enrollees in the sample were elevated during the year or two preceding the survey, but this could not necessarily be attributed to the program. Most of the enrollees were more hopeful about their life situations than they had been previously, but again it was difficult to attribute this directly to NYC participation.

Enrollees in both programs had doubled their wardrobes since they entered NYC, and in other personal possessions they were substantially better off than the companion non-NYC group. Some 40 percent had accumulated savings (approximately \$30 on the average), although savings were in general more of a substitute for credit buying than actual savings for long-term purposes. Twenty percent of the in-school enrollees, however, were saving for future educational purposes. In many cases the enrollees' contributions to their families, although small, had been sufficient to increase the total annual family income by as much as an estimated 35 percent. NYC income, however, while obviously of great importance to enrollees and their families, is not sufficient to affect housing, which the majority of enrollees listed as the principal need for themselves and their families, nor to provide the medical and dental care which many enrollees felt they needed.

In an attempt to measure unmet needs, respondents were asked how they would spend additional income of \$100 if it were available. More than half said (multiple answers were permitted) that they would pay bills, either their own or those owed by their families. The debts were found to be largely for clothing, furniture, etc. Almost a third said they would contribute the extra money to their families, and an equal number said they would buy clothing. Finally, 15 percent said they would spend it on educational or school-related expenses.

In general, enrollees were pleased with their NYC experience, but they wanted more hours of work in order to increase their income. The authors consider increased hours of work for in-school enrollees of dubious value, as more work time might further decrease their participation in extra-curricular activities, as well as depress their grades—which appeared not to have been improved by NYC participation. It is suggested that if any change is to be made the wage should be increased in the senior year to help meet costs of graduation. Also, in the authors' opinion, there appears to be some argument for pay differentials based on the personal and family responsibilities of enrollees. The financial burden is especially heavy on the young women who have responsibility for small children.

The authors think more meaningful jobs should be developed, especially for the young men. For the most part, for both in-school and out-of-school male enrollees, their jobs were dead end, uninteresting, and not likely to lead to anything better after completion of their NYC experience.

Optimizing Benefits for Rural Youth

Optimizing the Benefits of Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects for Rural Youth (Phase I), by Guy H. Miles; and A Follow-up Study of 1,144 Young Adults (Phase II), by Guy H. Miles, William F. Henry, and Ronald N. Taylor, North Star Research and Development Institute, Minneapolis, Minn., September 1969 (Contract No. 41-7-006-25).

The project was designed to determine what can be done to increase the benefits of NYC projects for rural youth. A necessary first step, covered in phase I of the study was, therefore, to explore the essential needs of rural youth. Do rural youth have unique problems of social and occupational adjustment not shared by urban youth? What factors in the rural environment are related to the adjustment problems of rural youth? And how might a rural NYC project differ from an urban project to meet the special problems of rural youth?

The first part of the report summarized the differing points of view of many persons concerning the current problems of rural youth with the object of formulating hypotheses concerning aspects of rural life that may negatively or positively affect the adjustment of rural youth to modern social and occupational conditions. The second phase of the study consisted of testing the validity of those hypotheses.

The author has made an attempt to identify all possible facets of rural life that might significantly affect adjustment of rural youth. Literature on the subject was searched. A representative cross section of 12 rural counties in the north-central region of the United States was studied. Interviews were obtained with over 100 rural residents in these counties, representing many different interests. Finally, because of the massive migration of rural youth to the cities, 60 interviews were held with selected residents of Des Moines and Minneapolis, cities to which much of the migration from the subject area was directed. Because the study was limited to problems faced by youth in that particular section of the country, it therefore reflects only those aspects of rural life peculiar to that region. The selected counties were in Iowa (5), Minnesota (4), South Dakota (2), and Wisconsin (1).

THE CHANGING ENVIRONMENT OF RURAL YOUTH

Many of the problems of the rural youth in the area studied result from rapid changes taking place in their environment. There has been heavy out-migration in recent years, and the decline in the number of farms has been almost exclusively in the low-income category. While low income may not be a primary cause of out-migration, the lack of economic opportunities in the rural areas, especially in those areas where industry is lacking, leads to movement to urban areas. Wage and salary work in agriculture has continued to decrease, and low wages make what work is available unattractive to rural youth.

It was assumed by most of the youth and older residents interviewed that if a young man or woman wanted a job in the city he could find it. Lack of skill or training was apparently not considered inhibiting.

As economic opportunities have shrunk, social factors also appear to push young people toward the cities. A large proportion of rural youth in the counties surveyed mentioned lack of social opportunities as a major reason for out-migration. Recreational facilities are scarce; youth of high school age appear to rely largely upon the automobile for their recreation. They have had little actual experience of the city, and their ideas of it were largely influenced by what they had seen on television—a place of excitement and glamor, but also of evil and danger. Farm youth and small town youth are equally inclined to migrate, and of the counties included in the survey it was estimated that at least 75 percent of all high school graduates were leaving the community.

There appears to be a tendency for the least educated and able to remain.

There was no indication that rural youth who went to the cities suffered, insofar as adjustment to work was concerned, from an inadequate educational background. In both Des Moines and Minneapolis-St. Paul, employers consistently said that there was no discernible difference between the educational backgrounds of rural and urban youth—except, possibly, in the areas of communications skills. This is not due to lack of educational background but rather to inability to make the optimum occupational adjustment because of lack of knowledge of how to find a job. It was clear, however, from this as well as other studies, that urban residents with farm or rural backgrounds are less likely to achieve as high an occupational status as urban-reared persons.

In particular it was pointed out that they were not acceptable for customer contact work because of inferior grooming and limited command of English.

Rural girls apparently adjust much more quickly to urban life, although both girls and boys seem to have some problems in social adjustment. The rural community generally seemed unaware of problems of social adjustment, just as it seemed unaware that rural youth might find it difficult to get work in the cities.

RURAL YOUTH AND RURAL EDUCATION

The characteristics of rural youth and adults may differ significantly from those of urban youth and adults. Such differences, if they exist, have profound implications for the kind of NYC program that would be most beneficial to rural youth. One indication of difference is that in an urban population there appears to be a positive relationship between low family income, low IQ scores for the children, and low school achievement. Among rural children there is no evidence that family income has any relationship either to level of intelligence or to school achievement.

While rural residents thought there were no differences between urban and rural children, urban employers noticed that rural youth were less aggressive, more willing to accept the decisions of older people, and less attentive to grooming, attire, and other aspects of social adjustment.

The high value placed on hard work was evident in almost every rural interview. In this context, there was strong anti-government sentiment, with programs criticized as "give-away" rather than requiring hard work. Rural residents appear to accept the assumption that people fall into two distinct groups—those from "better"

families who know how to work and are therefore successful, and those from "less desirable" families who have not learned how to work and are therefore not successful. For the latter, any effort toward changing their ways is considered as doomed to failure. This attitude was diffused among the entire community, including the schools, some of which were unwilling to work with NYC in finding jobs for the "undesirables." Another criticism of NYC was that it was a "poverty" program, and poverty and inadequacy are closely linked in rural thinking. This has had two effects on NYC programs: Unwillingness of community leaders to admit the existence of poverty in their communities, and consequently denial of any need for NYC; and refusal of the poverty-stricken themselves to admit they are in this group, and therefore unwillingness to permit their children to take part in the program.

The out-of-school program of NYC appeared to have little relevance in the counties studied. The number of rural high school dropouts is low, and large percentages of rural youth are going on to further training—many to college.

Rural residents were proud of their schools. School buildings were fairly modern and at least in as good shape as many urban schools, largely as a result of school consolidation. Teachers' pay is low, and many teachers are people who grew up in the area. Most of the schools visited had guidance of some kind, but largely by untrained counselors, and mostly was devoted to the students going on to college. The employment service was not playing an active role in counseling. Most of the schools lacked meaningful or realistic vocational training.

THE PRESENT NYC RURAL PROGRAM

Most of the counties visited were participating in NYC projects, largely multicounty and usually operated by a Community Action Program office. The Work-Training-In-Industry program was not being used—there is little industry in the areas, and the wage scales in whatever industry exists are so low that NYC scales were considered excessive. Most of the jobs provided to NYC enrollees are in the local schools—filing, secretarial, and receptionist jobs for the girls; school maintenance and janitorial work for the boys.

There was strong feeling among NYC rural directors that NYC is urban oriented in its guidelines, administration, and financial support, and that there is lack of understanding concerning rural problems. Rural NYC projects have special difficulties—large geographical

areas, and lack of transportation, industry, and functioning institutions. Many NYC directors thought some of the problems could be solved by increasing the number of youth participating in a given NYC project, thus warranting more effective administration and improved counseling and other services.

Even in counties where severe poverty exists, the NYC directors considered that family income is not the single, or even the most appropriate, basis for selection of participants. Isolation, either physical or social, they believe, is of equal importance.

NYC directors tended to set broader goals than the provision of a part-time job. They emphasized the need for learning both occupational and social skills, for better counseling, and, at least in some cases, better preparation for urban living. The interviews showed that three NYC projects were successfully operating some type of program aimed at urbanizing rural youth.

The second part of this study tested the various hypotheses developed in phase I. While the first part of the study covered 12 counties in four States in the north-central region of the United States; for the second part, 18 counties (a representative cross section of all rural counties in the region) located in 11 States were selected—on the basis of their median family incomes, population densities, and out-migration rates. Four small cities in four of the counties were selected for control purposes.

Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of youth selected from all students enrolled in the eighth grade in these counties and cities during the 1960-61 school year who would have been eligible (disregarding income) to enter an NYC project had one been available. Youth in institutions or in the armed services were not included. The questionnaire recipients were asked to give information on their early history, social adjustment, advanced education, and migration patterns. A total of 1,144 completed questionnaires (72 percent of the total queried) were returned. Contrary to one of the hypotheses set forth in the first portion of the study, it was found that almost 65 percent of the male students in the samples who responded had gone on to college. This was due, in part at least, to the very large number of young men who had gone into the armed services who, according to school records, were in the lower income and scholastic groups in their schools or were dropouts.

Most of the problems faced by rural youth in the North Central States result from the rapid changes taking place in their environment. The shift from farm to rural nonfarm living and to urban centers continues, with youth making up over 60 percent of all migrants. Among the youth in the sample, only 16 percent remained in their home counties during the 3-year

period following the date they graduated—or would have graduated—from high school. While a few of those who left moved to other rural areas, 77 percent went to a city. This report is concerned primarily with the factors that bring about such heavy out-migration; those elements associated with adequate adjustment to urban life; and ways in which NYC might ease the rural to urban transition.

The youth covered by this study were not disadvantaged in terms of minority group membership, educational deficiencies, or lack of food, shelter, and clothing. They were not in any way comparable to those of the NYC urban population, in that they were predominantly white, Protestant, and English-speaking. They were, however, disadvantaged by social and cultural isolation—in an environment which does not help them make the most adequate adjustment if they migrate, and offers extremely limited opportunities if they do not. This situation, the authors think, gives "disadvantaged" a different connotation and calls for guidelines for selecting NYC participants that are flexible enough to adapt to the social, economic, and geographic circumstances in the area being served.

The fact that many of the out-migrants returned to their rural homes indicated that they did not adjust. Of the noncollege youth who migrated to the cities, 25 percent of the young women and 43 percent of the young men returned to live in a rural area during the same 3-year period in which they migrated. Not only did fewer young women return, but their out-migration rate was considerably higher than that of young men. The youth most likely to be served by NYC (school dropouts, those from very low-income families and lower-grade students) were found to be much less inclined to leave the rural areas, and more inclined to return if they did. Communities are therefore drained of their more able young people. Dropouts, relatively few in number in the sample, were largely assimilated by the armed services. Since the dropout problem is not important, programs aimed at meeting the needs of this group are not necessary in rural areas.

Very few characteristics of the rural areas themselves were found to influence the rate of out-migration. Low median family income was most closely associated with high out-migration rates. Less important were availability of employment in manufacturing, and the relative lack of cultural facilities in the county. The migrating youth were almost equally divided between those who went to small (5,000 to 25,000 population), medium-size (25,000 to 100,000), and large (over 100,000) cities. The more isolated the county, the less the likelihood of a move to a major city.

Again, no evidence was found that the rural-to-urban migrant was at a severe disadvantage educationally. While rural schools lacked many facilities, equipment, staff, and curricula common to urban schools in the same part of the country, this appeared to have little if any effect on the employment or social adjustment of noncollege youth. These deficiencies did, however, have considerable negative effect on the grades and adjustment of many of the youth who went on to college.

Most of the schools surveyed had either no counselors or part-time counselors only. Lack of counseling was found to be related to entry-level salaries and socialization of youth who migrated to the cities. Most of the noncollege young men went into blue-collar jobs, the young women into white-collar jobs. The type of job was closely related to subsequent desire to return to the rural setting; those who found low-level work were much more inclined to return than those in higher level jobs.

Most of the rural counties surveyed had NYC programs, usually multicounty, and usually operated by the Community Action Program office. The multicounty approach seemed to work well in the less isolated counties. But it was not feasible in the geographically isolated areas, where the need was greatest and from which rural youth migrated in large numbers. As pointed out earlier, local schools provided most of the NYC jobs—secretarial, filing, etc., for the girls, school maintenance and janitorial work for the boys. Rural NYC directors felt strongly that there was lack of understanding of rural problems in NYC administration at all levels. Sparse population, lack of local social facilities, lack of industry and of transportation make many activities of urban NYC programs not feasible for rural projects. Directors generally favored giving more emphasis to social isolation as a qualification for NYC participation and less emphasis on severe poverty. They also felt that NYC should be much more active in counseling rural youth. This did not mean, however, that they believed rural youth should be prepared for urban living, since out-migration was considered detrimental to the good of the community. Many of the NYC projects, in fact, appeared definitely committed to encouraging youth to remain in the rural community.

The part-time work aspects of the NYC projects were a source of great dissatisfaction among many rural residents. One reason was that NYC wages were above those paid high school graduates in entry-level jobs in the community. NYC was looked upon as a "give-away" which does not pay an honest day's wage for an honest day's work. Work provided NYC male participants did not teach skills of value in entering the job market. While this was not true of the girls, the part-time jobs appeared, for the most part, to have little if any

influence on finding jobs after high school or on success in the job. The authors think that a helpful function of NYC might be to aid high-potential youth in low-income families go on to college. This would mean an individualized program, which would consider the needs of each enrollee, and might mean an approach which did not include part-time work experience for some.

The most obvious problem neglected by present NYC programs is, the authors consider, preparing rural youth for urban living. Could NYC serve as an institution to help the rural young man or woman adjust more adequately to urban life? Could it help fill the gap left by the failure of other rural institutions such as the church and the school? Perhaps, the authors suggest, NYC could help by familiarizing teachers with the problems of city life; by acquainting NYC participants with job-finding methods; by providing occupational and personal counseling; by furnishing information on urban occupations and industry, on training opportunities in industry, and on urban services; by offering instruction in grooming, financial budgeting, and similar problem areas; and by providing relevant work experience in an urban setting.

The authors admit that, since their findings indicate need for change in the rural NYC program, their recommendations emphasize the negative aspects of the program as now administered. Despite this, they assert that NYC has been "doing quite well" in most rural communities. Their recommendations include:

—More flexible guidelines for entry into NYC by redefining "disadvantaged" to give equal weight to low income, to geographical and social isolation.

—Recognition by rural NYC projects that since rural youth will migrate to the city, its objectives should include aiding them in making a successful transition to urban jobs and urban living.

—Where local leadership and local institutions are inadequate, outside resources should be used in helping solve the problems of rural youth.

—The part-time job aspect of NYC should be deemphasized in rural projects.

—Projects must be flexible enough to allow individualized approach to the problems of the individual.

—NYC should supplement rather than depend upon the weak rural educational system, by including vocational training, occupational familiarization, counseling, courses in office skills, extracurricular activities, and special education where needed.

—Training or other services provided should be applicable equally to urban or rural life.

—Administrative concepts should be modified to include cooperation between NYC projects in rural areas

and those in adjacent urban growth centers (conceived of as cities with population between 10,000 and 100,000).

The study includes a model for NYC projects which would be the cooperative effort of the regional NYC center located in a growth center and the CAP's or other local groups now sponsoring NYC projects within the area of the growth center. Such growth centers are, with the exception of the Great Plains, within an hour's commuting time of every rural resident in the north-central region. The regional NYC centers would facilitate cooperation in the NYC program by many other institutions, such as the employment service, local

industries, area vocational schools, and labor unions. They would employ specialists to provide services and training programs outside the scope of existing rural institutions. During the summer they would provide a program for rural participants, which would be limited to youth who would be high school seniors in the following year, or who were high school dropouts. The program would be oriented toward employment in an urban setting, or toward further training through vocational or apprenticeship programs. It would be a cooperative effort with the State employment service, the State department of education, and the agricultural extension agents in the areas affected.

Assessing Effects of NYC

An Assessment of the In-Public School Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects in Cincinnati and Detroit, With Special Reference to Summer-Only and Year-Round Enrollees by Gerald D. Robin, National Analysts, Inc., Philadelphia, Pa., February 1969 (Contract Nos. 41-7-001-37 and 81-40-66-18).

This study attempts to measure changes in experience, attitudes, and behavior which might have resulted from the NYC experience, in year-round (YR), in-school (IS), and summer-only (SO) NYC programs in Cincinnati and Detroit. Four groups of youths were interviewed (year-round and summer only enrollees, program drop-outs, and a control group) at three different intervals during the period from June 1966-June 1967. However, data on the drop-outs are not included in the study because the response rate was too low to be significant. In addition, a subsample of enrollees' mothers was interviewed once in each city. The study is restricted to 890 Negro youths (299 year-round, 348 summer-only, and 243 controls). Although white youth were interviewed, the number was too small to be significant, since very few whites were enrolled.

In both cities 31 percent of year-round enrollees were young men. Much higher percentages of young men were enrolled in the summer programs. Of the total enrollees in all groups, the great majority were between 16 and 18 years old, were in the eleventh or twelfth grade in school, and were enrolled in the "general" course. In both the enrollee and control groups many were from broken homes, many had police records, many came from larger than average families. All families were in the very-low-income group, although the control group in Detroit represented a compromise on the poverty-status differential, in that they were from families whose incomes were somewhat in excess of the NYC eligibility requirement.

It was neither a desire to stay in school nor hope for training or work experience that brought most of the youth into the NYC, but rather the need to earn money—mostly for clothes, school expenses, or to help their families. An equally important reason for entry, and perhaps meaning the same thing, was that the youth felt they had to have a job, and NYC was there.

However, a sizable proportion (about two-fifths) of each group said that they entered NYC to gain work experience and develop a skill. Most of those who gave the latter reason were girls. Also, more girls than boys said that NYC offered an opportunity for learning and accomplishment, and that they wanted to meet and learn to get along with others.

These reasons for entering NYC were in keeping with the understanding of most of the youth as to why NYC had been established. A substantial majority in all groups in both cities thought that the purpose of NYC was to provide job training and work experience, and approximately half thought it was to help youth become financially independent. Over half of the year-round enrollees and sizable proportions of the other groups believed, also, that the NYC was to further the education of young people.

As perceived by enrollees, the program—both summer-only and year-round—was a success, with satisfaction greatest among female year-round enrollees, and least among summer-only participants. The jobs of female enrollees were largely in tutoring and aid work, those of the males, primarily in custodial work. Only a relatively small proportion of the latter, however, expressed dissatisfaction with their work assignments. The enrollees' opinion of the occupational relevancy of their NYC experience declined between the first and second interviews more frequently than it increased, with boys more pessimistic about the value of their work experience than girls.

The study evaluates the NYC experience of the different groups from a number of points of view. First, how and to what extent did NYC participation affect attitudes toward education and school? Did such participation reduce dropouts? Did it increase educational aspirations or expectations? Did it change attitudes toward work or toward training for better jobs? Did it

result in improved school work and greater realization of the value of continued education? Did it reduce delinquency?

There appeared no indication in either Cincinnati or Detroit that the NYC experience of the enrollees had a positive influence on educational expectations or aspirations. Enrollee attitude toward the school system and toward teachers apparently was unchanged by NYC participation. Most of the youth in all three samples believed that graduation from high school would make a difference in their lives, that it qualifies one for *any* job or for a *better* job, and is necessary for higher education. In this respect NYC enrollees did not show greater awareness of the value of high school graduation than did the control group. Nor were the NYC enrollees more likely to have prepared themselves to go on to college than the youth in the control group.

The analysis of NYC participation and school performance likewise revealed no evidence that being in the program, either during exposure or upon termination, had a favorable effect upon the scholastic achievement of the enrollees. On the contrary, there was some evidence that NYC participation may have interfered with school performance of enrollees, many of whom were either failing or barely passing in their studies prior to enrollment.

The author points out that it is probable that few of the NYC enrollees had, previous to enrollment, spent much time on homework, and that even a moderate amount of time spent studying would improve their grades. Many of the youth who were undoubtedly doing poor work had been "moved along" for social reasons and for fairly regular school attendance. When such youth work from 5 to 15 hours a week, they may become even more alienated from school as a result of the conflict between school and work. Since, to them, the value of immediate income takes precedence over earning good grades, it is understandable that the time, however short, previously spent on homework may be reduced. In this case, however, time spent on school-work or on homework remained essentially unchanged by NYC participation.

The author concludes: "... the data of the SO group indicate that the NYC had no 'carry-over' effect into the classroom after termination from the program, and the YR data indicate that while these enrollees were working in the program and attending school at the same time, their grades were not affected. Moreover, and finally, it is of more than passing interest to note that there was somewhat greater retrogression or impairment in school performance among experimental youth whose grade averages prior to enrollment were barely passing than in the case of the control youth."

Approximately a year after the first interview, school records were consulted in order to determine whether the enrollees had dropped out of school, graduated, or were still in high school. To measure possible effect of NYC in reducing dropouts, the dropout rates of the control and the experimental groups were compared. In Detroit, 11 percent of each group had become school dropouts. A significantly larger proportion of the summer-only enrollees than of the year-round enrollees had dropped out. In Cincinnati the dropout rate did not vary, as in Detroit, with the length of time in the program, or with sex. In both the NYC enrollee and the control groups, boys had consistently considered dropping out of school more frequently than girls. Among those who had actually dropped out, dislike for school, discouragement over grades, and income-related problems were primary reasons, although a sizable number of girls left school because of pregnancy. A third of the Cincinnati and a fifth of the Detroit enrollees who had considered dropping out said that the NYC was responsible for their decision to remain in school.

While the author concedes that at neither of the two study sites was the NYC notably successful in preventing youth from dropping out of school, he points out that it may be unreasonable to expect that NYC will exert any definitive influence on the very complex causes associated with dropping out of school. It should be remembered, he says, that the NYC is primarily a job-creation and job-opportunity experience.

If NYC participation did not apparently affect in any significant way the attitudes and school performance of enrollees toward school what were its effects with regard to work, to the idea of what constituted a "good" job, to perception of future occupational possibilities and the relationship between the NYC and later employment?

In both experimental samples, during the first interview the youth strongly believed that their NYC experience would be helpful in securing suitable employment later in life; however, this belief declined substantially between the first and last interviews. Most thought that their NYC experience would give them a moderate but not marked advantage in jobseeking. When the initial attitude was held constant a much larger proportion of the group revised their opinion of NYC occupational relevance downward rather than upward. This negative attitude was much more prevalent among boys than girls.

There was no indication that NYC participation increased the desire for further training as the road to better jobs. Immediate job security was preferred over future occupational mobility by as large a proportion of the NYC enrollees as of the control group. Of special interest is the fact that a vast majority of all three groups

of youth believed that their own inadequacies of education, skill, experience, etc., would be responsible for their difficulties in finding employment. Few, for example, mentioned discrimination as a possible impediment to their future employment.

Another measure of the effect of NYC participation was what, if any, changes had been brought about in the attitude of enrollees toward the police and police contacts. It appeared that, based upon comparisons between enrollees and controls, NYC participation among both males and females was unrelated to delinquency prevention or reduction. In neither Detroit nor Cincinnati was there any evidence that delinquency was reduced because the youth were working in the program, again on comparison between NYC participants and the control group.

Despite the generally negative findings in the study, the author is emphatic in his warning that the in-school NYC program should not be written off as failing to make a significant and worthwhile contribution to the "lives and futures" of its enrollees. Expectations of the

program may be inflated. Should it be expected to change educational aspirations and expectations? Should it be expected to result in a more favorable perspective on occupational mobility? Should it be expected to result in a reduction in school dropout rates or police contacts? Should it be expected to bring about a change in family relationships? It should be remembered that the in-school NYC was established solely as a means of providing jobs and some additional income to young men and women in need of them, and who might not otherwise be able to find work while going to school.

If NYC does nothing more than create, on a large scale, job experience and income-producing opportunities for poor youth, the author concludes, it has made a worthwhile contribution. The "acid test" of program effectiveness has not, the author points out, been approached in his study. To measure effectiveness of NYC participation requires a followup study of former NYC enrollees after they have finished with their schooling and entered into work.

Developing Testing Techniques

Development of Evaluation Measures for Use with Neighborhood Youth Corps Enrollees by
Norman E. Freeberg, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, N.J., December 1968 (Contract No.
66-00-9).

In recent years the available formal paper-and-pencil tests have been increasingly recognized as inadequate in testing persons from culturally deprived or disadvantaged backgrounds. This study represents an initial phase in the development and application of a battery of measures suitable for guidance research and counseling of disadvantaged youth enrolled in training and work programs. New paper-and-pencil tests devised attempt to compensate for the deficiencies of tests which have been available in the past, by shaping content, format, and administration to the academic level and cultural background of the disadvantaged youth for whom the tests are intended. The study focuses upon problems of measurement associated with young school dropouts for whom some forms of work experience and vocational counseling are being provided—more particularly for evaluation of NYC enrollees.

A sample of 256 NYC enrollees in the out-of-school program constituted the respondents for the study. Administration of the tests was carried out separately for the males and the females; respondents were enrollees who had been in the program approximately 1 to 3 months. Eleven NYC projects participated in the study—nine were located in exclusively urban areas; the other two, in southern rural areas. In both the male and the female samples a large proportion were Negro, with whites (including Puerto Rican) constituting only 15 percent of the total; of the female group, approximately 90 percent were Negro, the remaining 10 percent white (including Puerto Rican). Both counselor and work supervisor ratings were obtained for a majority of the enrollees.

A battery of 13 test booklets was developed, each booklet incorporating such characteristics as relatively low verbal levels, oral presentation, and in many cases pictorial formats. The booklets deal with areas of job knowledge, such as education required, where the work is performed, salary, tasks performed, working hours, and tools required; vocational orientation and aspirations (plans, hopes, knowledge, and interests); attitudes (toward self, authority, and social values); deferred gratification (ability to delay present rewards for future gains); and jobseeking and job-holding skills (how to find a job, and how to behave in order to keep it); motivation for vocational achievement (intensity of willingness to stay on a job); and job related practical reasoning ability.

Based upon analyses of item characteristics, reliability estimates, validity (against proficiency ratings), factor analysis of the battery and research related findings, a number of the measures were shown to possess a pattern of psychometric characteristics that warrant further research on their refinement and application. Development of these measures is continuing under an additional contract. Contents of the measures will be refined, and their usefulness as a guidance tool in a youth training program will be defined, with primary stress upon counseling and placement. It is expected that the measures, when the research is completed, will enable counselors to assess youth characteristics upon enrollment and will assist both enrollees and counselors in selecting the best training situations for each individual enrollee. As noted, the researchers are in general agreement that this is an area which requires considerable improvement.

The Out-of-School Program in Houston

Houston's Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps by Edwin Harwood and Robert Olasov, Rice University, Houston, Tex., October 1968 (Contract No. 41-7-003-46).

This study not only reports on the effects of NYC projects in Houston but describes in considerable detail the organizational structure of the projects, processing of enrollees, staff functions, difficulties and tensions encountered, and differences between projects in work assignments, counseling, and supervisory techniques.

While three separate NYC projects were operating in Houston at the time of the study, which covered the period from the summer of 1967 through the 1967-68 school year, only two—Job Opportunities for Youth (JOY) and the Harris County Commissioners Court (Commissioners Court) were studied. One of the authors spent 6 months working alongside trainees as a participant-observer, attending counseling sessions, etc. In the summer of 1967, the two programs had 350 and 200 slots, respectively. Both were subsequently reduced. One difficulty the authors encountered was that changes were constantly being introduced into the programs by the sponsors (officially) or by the staff (unofficially). Counselors might, for example, change the procedure for placing new entrants or substitute one type of test for another.

The two projects in Houston were organized along different lines. At JOY staff specialization had developed, with counselors assigned to certain types of trainees; at Commissioners Court the organization was less formal. At JOY the staff attempted to provide supplementary educational, health, and welfare services, rather than administering a one-service program; at Commissioners Court counseling was considered strictly as vocational guidance. At JOY, clerical and technical jobs were emphasized as much as possible; work stations at Commissioners Court provided intermediate and low-level jobs almost entirely.

As the study continued, the authors found that both projects were redefining the purpose of the out-of-school programs from simple work experience to vocational training for better paying jobs, with success of the program judged largely by placement of trainees in

employment. Applicants were much more closely screened at JOY, where they were divided into "high-level" and "low-level" groups, with work station assignments allotted accordingly—resulting in a well-defined pattern of discrimination against the most disadvantaged youth in job placement. Little testing or screening took place at Commissioners Court, where many of the jobs available were in low-skill custodial work requiring less education than, for example, jobs as clerk-typists.

In 18 months of operation (from July 1966 through February 1968) 239 of JOY's 835 trainees who had left NYC were known to have found permanent jobs, paying from \$40 to \$80 a week. This represented a significant increase over wages received by the trainees in their pre-NYC employment. A large majority of the enrollees, both male and female, had worked before entering the NYC program, mostly in unskilled service or laboring jobs.

The dropout rate in both programs was high. Of a total of 800 JOY enrollees who had left the program by June 1968, some 40 percent of the young men were terminated because of bad attitude and absenteeism; almost half of the young men 18 years and older left for full time jobs, compared with slightly more than a fourth of the young women in that age group. About equal proportions of young men and young women returned to school, but of this group the latter were more likely to be in the older (18-19 and 20-22) age groups (the 16-17 age group accounted for almost all of the young men who returned to school). Since significantly larger proportions of both males and females left the program for full-time jobs after they reached 18 years of age, it would appear that the 16- and 17-year-olds have a harder time finding jobs as attractive as those in the NYC.

Although, in the authors' opinion, the NYC programs in Houston were considered by sponsors, counselors, and trainees as established primarily to give vocational training (and not to provide work experience), the

announcement in the fall of 1967 that work-training in industry was now a part of the program was met with enthusiasm. Counselors felt that even though they had been providing work training, it had not led, for the most part, to permanent jobs in private industry and commerce. Work-training-in-industry jobs (WTI) could also be considered a form of post-NYC employment, and therefore as completion of the NYC program.

Difficulties were met, however, in the attempt to line up companies willing to undertake any part in the program. Between November 1967 and the following April, 488 private firms were contacted by JOY and 240 by Commissioners Court. Only 12 and eight of the companies, respectively, signed WTI contracts, although a number of others agreed to accept referrals of NYC enrollees. Ultimately, however, the eligible NYC trainees were placed, although the most sought after trainees—boys 18 years of age or older—were not available. In the opinion of the project supervisors, only a handful of the boys had demonstrated the reliability that would justify referral to the WTI program.

Another difficulty encountered was the unwillingness of a significant portion of the girls to take industrial work; they preferred to remain in NYC work-assignments, where discipline was likely to be more relaxed. Some boys also preferred the less demanding work provided by NYC even though the wages were considerably below those offered in industry. From one counselor's point of view, WTI's greatest potential benefit was that it would help break down barriers like requirement of a high school diploma, or company tests which disadvantaged youth could not pass.

Both of Houston's projects made serious efforts to get enrollees to return to school or, failing that, to prepare for and take the General Education Development Exam (GED) which many employers accept in lieu of a high school diploma. By far the most important advanced educational program, however, turned out to be MDTA, Phase II, designed especially for the NYC out-of-school program, combining 20 hours of classroom work with 20 hours of job experience per week. The authors believe that redefinition of the NYC role (that of preparing enrollees for established occupational jobs) had been a gradual and unanticipated response to both internal and external pressures, and that the MDTA program gave sanction to this redefinition. Well over half of the NYC enrollees in Houston were, in the fall of 1967, in one of the MDTA vocational courses—nurse aid, alteration tailoring, clerical, etc. Those enrolled, however, many of whom found employment, were young women. Therefore, no MDTA courses were set up for male NYC enrollees.

The difficulties encountered by both supervisory and

counselor personnel in the field of discipline are analyzed in some detail. All too often, it was found, actual supervision of NYC enrollees was passed down from the person named as the supervisor to regular employees under the supervisor's authority. These employees were sometimes not much more advanced than the trainees in their education and work habits, with similar absenteeism and attitude problems. It appeared clear that divided supervision was unsatisfactory; too close supervision aroused resentment, while too lax supervision led to little work and little learning. The most satisfactory supervision occurred where trainees had a set routine and duties and were kept busy at work they felt to be important. The enrollee's attitude toward the job appeared to depend, in large part, on the degree to which he or she was integrated into the agency's informal social organization as well as into the work routine. Different work stations were surveyed in some detail. At one, training and supervision were unsatisfactory because supervisors (for the most part skilled maintenance mechanics) were annoyed at the demands on their time, not in sympathy with the trainees, and unwilling to give them work enough to keep them busy or to instruct them in a serious fashion.

As in other studies, the enrollees in the Houston out-of-school projects were in the large majority young Negro women, many with one or more small children. Male enrollees were for the most part younger than the females. The authors believe that the reason boys frequently do not enter the program, or do not remain long, is because they can earn more money in unskilled and semi-skilled jobs, and they look upon NYC as merely stopgap employment. The NYC can also be called an employer of last resort for the significant number of male enrollees who are retarded, brain damaged, or emotionally disturbed. However, for female enrollees, who cannot compete as well for the better paying semi-skilled and blue-collar jobs, NYC offers not only a job but one which, in many cases, can be made compatible with their family responsibilities and which pays more than most of the unskilled service jobs available to Negro female dropouts. Some highly motivated girls use NYC to achieve upward mobility, acquiring skills while getting paid to help maintain themselves and their families, which they could not have done had they stayed in school. The most important handicap to the economic adjustment of the girls, the authors feel, is early pregnancy. Many could have improved their situation without NYC if they had been able to solve their child care and transportation problems.

The research rated remedial education in the Houston program as a failure. Some of the enrollees, it was

believed, were too advanced for the material offered; others could not take advantage of the educational opportunities offered because their functional educational level was too low and they resisted remedial education.

Group counseling appeared to be helpful when the materials used were interesting and concrete. However, as far as the authors were able to judge, such counseling did not affect attitude problems of the enrollees. They believe that these problems should be dealt with in connection with the type of work, the social environment of the work place, and the supervisory style which trainees encounter. Trainees who are provided meaning-

ful and interesting work, are treated like regular adult employees, and are dealt with firmly but without demanding or hostile reference have few attitude problems.

As in the other studies concerning NYC, it is concluded that because so many of the work assignments are low level and unskilled, the supervisors often are indifferent, if not downright hostile, and are not prepared to teach enrollees the skills which might lead to better post-NYC employment. One suggestion the authors offer is that supervisors not only be more fully instructed as to the purposes of the NYC but be given extra pay for their supervisory work.

NYC Experience and Future Employment

Disadvantaged Youth Approaching the World of Work: A Study of NYC Enrollees in New York City by Wallace Mandell, Sheldon Blackman, and Clyde E. Sullivan, Wakoff Research Center, Staten Island, N.Y., June 1969 (Contract No. 41-7-009-34).

This research project had two principal objectives: First, to study congruity or lack of it in the job-related perceptions and the attitudes regarding jobseeking activities of a combined group of NYC enrollees, their work-experience supervisors, and the employers in the general labor market who had interviewed these youth; second, to examine the effect of NYC work experience on job-related perceptions and performance of NYC enrollees.

Five groups were selected for study: (1) 297 NYC enrollees who were interviewed within the first 3 months of their entry into the program; (2) a separate group of 311 NYC enrollees interviewed during the last 3 months of their NYC participation; (3) of this latter group, 74 enrollees who looked for jobs *after* some NYC experience; (4) 60 NYC work supervisors who supervised the group of enrollees who had looked for work; and (5) 49 employers who had interviewed these enrollees.

For the congruity part of the study, it was possible to interview 40 enrollees who had looked for work, their own supervisors, and their interviewing employers. (Using these 40 "triplets," the researchers concentrated on examining the work-related attitudes and perceptions of enrollees, supervisors, and employers.) All NYC enrollees in groups 1 and 2 above were included in the second phase of the research project.

Enrollees were selected from nine NYC projects in New York City, operating in areas that include some of the most seriously vocationally disadvantaged populations in the city. The interviews, conducted in the early part of 1968, were structured to elicit expectations of the demands and rewards of the work situation in five major categories: Skills required; tolerance of employers for variability in behavior; employee-employer relationships (the amount of socializing and social acceptance by peers expected of the entering employees); supervisor-employee relationships (the extent and intensity of control to be expected from work supervisors, and the

responses enrollees should make); and employee benefits.

Enrollees interviewed exhibited characteristics similar to those of NYC participants in other programs; the majority were between 17 and 19 years old; almost half were Negro, and some two-fifths of the remainder were Puerto Rican; one-sixth were female; and over nine-tenths were high school dropouts.

Eleven of the 40 enrollees questioned in the study for congruity of perception had not gone beyond the ninth grade in school; seven had completed the eleventh grade; and only three, the twelfth. Almost half had been in the general course in high school.

About half of the employers who had interviewed the 40 NYC youth were in local firms; only two were in manufacturing, the others in trade or service industries of various kinds. The largest number of enrollees applied for clerical jobs, with the structural trades next.

The study of congruity among enrollees, supervisors, and employers presented a picture of youth frightened by the prospect of entering the work world, which they envisioned as extremely demanding, and for which they felt essentially unprepared. For example, they considered abilities as more necessary than did either the supervisor or the employer. While all three groups agreed upon the youth's lack of preparation, supervisors and employers, unlike the enrollees, believed that little preparation was needed. When questioned whether high school graduation is necessary, only 12 percent of the total group believed it was, but the number of enrollees answering "yes" was considerably larger than that of either supervisors or employers. Both enrollees and supervisors rated work experience as a more necessary qualification for employment than did employers. Enrollees saw the work situation as more stringent and demanding than did either the supervisors or the employers. Enrollees saw the employment interview and the request for references as critical, with references

considered the more important, while supervisors and employers looked upon it as a testing situation only. All three groups agreed that applicants for a job should ask about employee benefits, but a fourth of the enrollees said that they would take the job and find out later about such benefits. All three groups showed general agreement on the impact of employee nonconformity on the employer, and also on a rather stringent set of standards as to absences, tardiness, etc., but again the enrollees' viewed the standards as more severe than did the other two groups.

The authors believe the situation can be looked upon as a field in which barriers have been erected between the youth and their goal of meaningful employment, leaving them the alternative of crashing the barrier, going around it, fleeing from it, or lying passively in front of it. The first two imply rebellion or subversion. Passivity implies unemployment, or the intermittent and casual employment associated with bachelor life in the ghetto with no hope of change in status. Fleeing the field implies leaving the legitimate field of work for illegal activities.

The early and late panels of enrollees (groups 1 and 2) were interviewed in an attempt to study the effects of NYC experience and work-related perceptions. Of 145 variables examined, only 13 yielded significant differences. The early and late groups did not differ significantly in work-related perceptions from the smaller sample even though a considerably larger percentage of the overall group believed that graduation from high school was necessary.

The authors found that in general the enrollees tended to overvalue their NYC experience. A high percentage believed vocational training important. They believed they were inadequate in the area of job-related skills. Their views of tolerance of behavior variability was essentially the same as those of the 40 enrollees who had sought jobs. The larger group believed testing for skills and abilities took place in the employment interview, while the smaller group had considered references more important. There was little objection to the established structure of requirements and testing.

Asked what kind of position they would look for after they left NYC, only about a third of the enrollees stated they would seek positions related to their NYC experience.

It has often been assumed that disadvantaged youth lack ambition to obtain meaningful employment, and that this attitude is manifested by tardiness, absences, faulty work habits, etc. An aim of the NYC might be the correction of improper work habits. In this study, the enrollees' view of work demands started out by being more demanding and restrictive than those of either

employers or supervisors and, in fact, did not change with NYC experience. In the face of this it would appear that it would be difficult to make the youth take still more rigid attitudes. So it is not surprising, the authors find, that NYC experience results in little change in the enrollees' work-related perceptions. Indeed, they conclude, a program that encouraged the youth to adopt a less rigid attitude with regard to work would seem in order. As mentioned before, the youth see themselves already as having few abilities and view job requirements as stringent. The authors conclude that NYC's major efforts should be expended in reducing the barriers between the youth and the process of entry to employment. Three major elements must be dealt with—work credentials must be supplied, access routes to work must be made available, and the youth must approach employment with a realistic view of the working world.

The relevance of NYC experience to these three elements was examined. In terms of view, NYC experience did not apparently increase enrollees' optimism that the world will be benevolent, nor did it appear to increase their confidence that efforts on their part could obtain better economic opportunities. Because they were more rigid in their view of the necessity for behavioral conformity than either supervisors or employers, it did not appear that NYC experience increased their knowledge of behavioral conformity. In terms of credentials, skill development did not appear to be enhanced by NYC experience, since 50 percent of those interviewed were engaged in work placements which were irrelevant to their career aspirations. Very few enrollees could use their work experience even as informal credentials in obtaining work. In terms of access, the NYC was not able to open work opportunities for the majority of the enrollees, although NYC leadership was "acutely aware" of this need.

The aspirations of the enrollees were clearly directed toward getting jobs and obtaining income; their knowledge of skills required for employment was realistic; they understood non-work-related behavior requirements and indeed did not question them. It is clear that this group of enrollees for the most part held career aspirations that were realistic, and for which they would seem fitted without further academic preparation. About one-fifth had inappropriate career aspirations in view of the fact that they were school dropouts. For this group, specialized services would seem to be necessary to help them form more realistic goals.

Potentiality of youth for work success may be developed through counseling and information programs. The opportunity structure can be enlarged by dissemination of information to employers, opening closed job markets, and realistic prediction of future

opportunities as a basis for training and education. But programs linking the youth to currently available work opportunities were not found because NYC did not have mechanisms for skill development, opening access, or offering incentives to move the youth into the profit-making sector. This meant frustration to NYC personnel and enrollees alike. The need is apparent, the authors state, for structuring NYC so that a variety of programs can be provided to youth of differing needs. Broad categories of youth requiring individualized programming are, according to the authors: Youth who have no employment plans and are unable to visualize how work can meet their needs; youth who have high aspirations that appear impossible to attain, which may arise from lack of information or a defensive reaction to low self-esteem; youth lost to the job market because they lack information about jobs and have no access to jobs; and youth without the optimism and self-confidence for the stresses of jobseeking.

The authors categorize two broad problem areas confronting poor urban youths: Restricted opportunity because access to the job market is limited in various ways, and because the number of jobs available to them is decreasing; and unavailability of job opportunities to unskilled and casual work which contrasts sharply with their ideals regarding work and forces them to look to nonwork activities for personal, social, and status gratification.

Some enrollees regarded NYC itself as an alternative to working in industry, rather than as a step toward such work. NYC was simply providing a job, and so there was

a frequently expressed desire for higher wages or more hours of work. NYC was, for these youth, a sheltered work setting, serving as a buffer against prejudice, the competitive work structure, job instability, and the stigma of "boy's" jobs. Other enrollees indicated that they saw participation in illegal activities as an alternative to work.

Three major recommendations issue from the findings of this study: (1) New York NYC projects should be brought into greater conformity with the Federal model. NYC projects in New York City, the authors state categorically, have never implemented the intent of the program. Early decisions made at the local level committed local agencies to programs that reduced flexibility and prevented implementation of the program as conceived at the Federal level. One example is the work experience placement of youth, which was originally premised on the provision of work-related experiences relevant to success in the profit-making sector of the economy. Instead, the work experience generally has been in nonprofit institutions, and in nonproductive work within those institutions. (2) A variety of programs to fit individual enrollee's needs should be developed within NYC. (3) Action should be taken to improve the opportunity structure. For such youth as those in NYC programs this action should include job-finding programs, job-restructuring programs, and legal approaches to open job opportunities, especially to young men and women of minority groups. Any program preparing youth for work should develop procedures for easing the transition from the training process into the work economy.

Effectiveness of Urban Out-of-School Programs

A Retrospective Study of the Effectiveness of Out-of-School NYC Programs in Four Urban Sites
(Phase I) by Regis H. Walther and Margaret L. Magnusson, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., November 1967 (Contract No. 81-09-66-19).

A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Projects: Summary Report and Implications for Program Effectiveness (Phase II) by Regis H. Walther, Margaret Magnusson, and Shirley Cherkasky, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., December 1968 (Contract No. 41-7-004-9).

In 1966, a 5-year longitudinal study was undertaken of the NYC out-of-school programs, in five urban cities—Cincinnati, Durham, St. Louis, East St. Louis, and Pittsburgh (which was selected for the site of two special research projects). This project encompassed a general survey of the NYC projects in four of the urban centers, and it also produced a series of separate reports on various aspects of NYC activity. It was the most comprehensive and detailed survey undertaken in the Department of Labor's research on the NYC.

Two overall reports of what the authors call phases I and II of the study have been received, and for the purposes of this analysis discussion of the two is combined. Phase I was based on analysis of followup interviews conducted in late 1966 and early 1967 with experimental and control groups enrolled in NYC in the latter part of 1965. Phase II was based on a second round of interviews with the NYC enrollees controls interviewed in phase I. Three of the individual components of the project are reported separately, following this article. They are (1) the Clerical Co-Op Study—an analysis of a specialized skill-training program for females in Cincinnati; (2) a Termination Study—interviews with a sample of NYC enrollees who dropped out of the program; and (3) the Work-Relevant Study—development of scales to measure work attitudes of NYC enrollees so that they can be classified according to their needs and the services required.

Not yet received is the final report on the Accelerated Learning Experiment, an analysis of an experimental remedial education program undertaken in three cities. However, a preliminary report is discussed later in this analysis. In addition, a new research project is underway—A Study of Negro Male High School Dropouts Who

Are Not Reached by Federal Work-Training Programs (NYC). Discussion of this later aspect of the research will be forthcoming when the final report is received.

Enrollees for the most part first heard of NYC through friends with NYC experience; organized recruitment services were used infrequently. Female enrollees were most frequently given work assignments as professional aids, with clerical work second; for male enrollees, cleaning and maintenance work was first, that of professional aid second. According to the authors, results of the study suggest strongly that work assignments had more positive value for the young women because they resulted in experience which could be transferred to permanent jobs, such as library or teachers' aid or clerical work, and brought the girls in contact with professionally trained persons. The young men, on the other hand, were for the most part assigned to dead end, unskilled jobs, supervised by unskilled or semi-skilled maintenance personnel.

While both boys and girls gave a high rating as to their satisfaction with NYC, the latter rated the program higher in both enjoyment and usefulness. Learning job skills, acquiring good work habits, and earning money were listed, in that order, as the most helpful aspects of NYC experience. The female enrollees were much more confident that NYC would be helpful to them in getting a job. The enrollees in Cincinnati and St. Louis showed more confidence in this aspect of the program than those in other cities. The youth's reports of their NYC experience indicate that the program was stimulating and interesting, but that it was valued mostly in terms of its employment context.

Phase I of the overall project, The Prospective Study, covers only four of the five program sites (Pittsburgh is

not included). This first project was designed to survey the effectiveness of the NYC program, through comparison of experimental and control groups, on the basis of community and work adjustment. Completed interviews numbered 392 in the experimental and 205 in the control groups, but information from friends and relatives raised these numbers to 438 experimental and 238 control subjects.

The experimental group was made up of NYC enrollees who had been in the program from the fall and winter of 1965-66, a little over a year before the followup study in the winter and spring of 1967. The control sample was comprised of youth of similar age, sex, race, and schooling, and percentages of youth from families living in public housing and receiving welfare. In both samples, approximately 60 percent were Negro girls, 30 percent Negro boys, 7 percent white boys and 3 percent white girls. At one research site, subjects were poor to average students, and about the same number (28 percent of the experimental and 32 percent of the control group) had police records. The experimental and control groups differed in some degree: Males made up 11 percent of the control group, 6 percent of the experimental; relatively fewer controls had obvious physical defects (5 and 10 percent, respectively); control group members had been out of school an average of 14 months, experimental group members 17 months. Average age of enrollees at the time of the initial interview was a little over 20 years, and average grade completed was about the tenth.

The female enrollees tended to stay considerably longer in NYC. Larger proportions of young men left the program after less than a 3-month enrollment (33 percent of them stayed 3 months or less), while only 18 percent of the young women left in that period of time. Substantial differences were found among the different programs with respect to length of enrollment, and later phases of the study will probe more deeply into that aspect and also into the achievement of NYC objectives. It was found that enrollees who terminated, however, frequently reentered the program, and the authors recommend consideration of furlough rather than termination when enrollees drop out of the program.

Most of the enrollees in all projects met with counselors—some as frequently as once a week, others only once a month. About half of the enrollees at all four sites considered their counselors to be very helpful. About two-thirds of the enrollees reported that NYC has already helped them get a job, or they expect it will. At the time of the interview, almost a third of the young women were still in NYC (as compared with 11 percent of the young men), but 28 percent of the experimental (no longer in NYC) and 42 percent of the control groups

were unemployed. Many more of the boys (29 percent) in the control group had gone into military service than from the experimental group (only 9 percent). The authors point out that this may result either from relatively more enlistments in the control sample or from relatively more physical disqualifications in the experimental group. However, the differences might, it is suggested, indicate that NYC experience had been a factor in reducing the unemployment which may have led to enlistments.

In the long run the effectiveness of the NYC program will be judged by its contribution to the successful adult functioning of former enrollees. This retrospective portion of the study covered too short a period to permit reaching conclusions. Still, some preliminary indications of program effectiveness were considered justified. For example, a significant difference was found between the experimental and control groups in the percentage of unemployment among young women (despite the fact that almost a third of the experimental group were still in NYC) but not among the men. More young women had found employment through NYC than had young men, and they had frequently been hired in clerical or aid jobs. Moreover, those in the experimental group depended upon their own earnings far more frequently than did those in the control group. This greater self-reliance, together with the lower unemployment rate in the female experimental sample, provides evidence that the NYC experience had improved the work adjustment of the young women. The most significant improvement for the young men (as shown in the Durham program) appeared to be their greater participation in academic or vocational education after leaving NYC, as compared with their control group.

In both the experimental and control groups, the authors found the youth were poorly prepared for successful work adjustment with respect to academic or vocational skills. Almost twice as many of the subjects in the experimental group had attended some type of academic or vocational educational classes after leaving school, with significantly more of the young women reporting such supplemental education.

The survey attempted to measure the youth's self-concept, which influences how well they adjust to their life situation. Nearly half of the female enrollees, as compared with 17 percent of the males, had goals as professionals or as professional aids. Both the young men and the young women in the enrollee group exceeded those in the control group in their occupational expectations.

The authors point out certain problem areas which their research uncovered. While the NYC in urban areas was enrolling seriously disadvantaged youth, it had not

enrolled white youth in any significant number. The few white girls who did apply appeared to be more disadvantaged than the Negroes (they had dropped out of school earlier; had been out of school longer; and were rated lower on appearance, speech, and poise), but their number was so small that drawing any valid conclusion was not possible.

While special public employment offices have been established to help disadvantaged youth, they were not giving substantial help in placing the type of youth enrolled in the NYC projects surveyed—partly at least, because so few youth called upon them. Moreover, there was little or no coordination with other programs, such as Job Corps or MDTA training. Nor was there cooperation with many of the schools to provide remedial education for enrollees—an area of serious weakness in most of the programs. The attitude of many of the schools was that they did not want out-of-school enrollees and did not encourage them to return to school; rather, they indeed made it difficult for them to do so. Enrollees, in many cases, had a feeling of animosity toward school which made them unwilling to return on any basis.

Followup counseling was inadequate. Personal counseling varied by program, with Durham and St. Louis giving it the greatest emphasis and keeping in closest touch with enrollees at the worksites. In Cincinnati, counselors were further removed from worksites, and in East St. Louis they put emphasis on work rather than on personal counseling.

The authors identified three general areas of deficiency or disadvantage among NYC enrollees: (1) Lack of opportunity; (2) rebellious attitude toward authority; and (3) low self-esteem. The programs studied did not take into consideration personal disadvantages or disabilities or the individual needs of the enrollees in making work assignments or in the type of support services offered. This particular characteristic of the programs will be discussed in more detail in the second phase of this report.

In two appendixes to this first report, the authors include a special discussion of the relationship between NYC experience and the police records of enrollees in Cincinnati and Durham. (No comparable study was made at the other sites.) In Cincinnati, the sample of 230 youth (selected from approximately 800 enrolled in the out-of-school program in April 1966) was divided almost equally between boys and girls. The control group was selected from applicants who had applied for the program prior to April 1966 but had not been accepted. The number and type of police charges were obtained by checking police records. The average time between the date of application to NYC and the check

of the police records was 15 months. While the authors recognize that police records, as a measure of program effectiveness, are not altogether satisfactory, they believe this is the best method available of determining criminal or delinquent behavior.

About half of the young men and women in both the experimental and the control groups had police records, with an average of about 2.6 charges each. (A much larger proportion of the boys, 63 percent, than the girls, 31 percent, had records; with an average of 4.4 charges as against less than one each.) For members of both groups the number of police contacts decreased as they became older. The Negro boys in the experimental sample had a higher rate of police contacts than those in the control groups, and the nature of the charges was more serious. However, the number of police charges declined for the experimental group after application for NYC, and at the same time the seriousness of the offenses decreased. Charges for crimes against property and other persons decreased from 49 to 20 percent of total charges against all members of the experimental group, while such charges increased for the control group from 38 to 48 percent of all charges. The most dramatic decrease was in the charges against the young women in the experimental group; only one was charged with any crime after date of application, and that was for runaway.

The tendency for enrollees to be charged with fewer offenses than control subjects, the authors found, was consistent with the impression of police officials in this and other cities who reported that the out-of-school NYC program is noticeably decreasing crimes among participating youths. The authors believe, also, that the more dramatic decrease among girls than boys in the program was due, in part, to their better job assignments. "The results of this study," the authors conclude, "lead to the tentative conclusion that enrollment in this out-of-school program is associated with a decline in the number and gravity of police contacts, particularly among female enrollees."

In Durham, the experimental group consisted of 133 persons, the control group of 102. Both groups were predominantly Negro and female. Again the individuals' records were checked through the local police department. Police reporting in Durham was limited in juvenile contacts to those that led to referral to "juvenile authorities," which somewhat minimized the number of juvenile contacts and accentuated their severity.

In the period before December 31, 1965, the experimental group contained 21 youth with adult police contacts and the control group, five. The experimental group also had more charges per individual. It was clear that the experimental group had been in far

more trouble with the police than had the control group.

The number of adult charges in the experimental group declined from 45 before December 31, 1965, to 27 after that date. In the control group, however, the number rose from 7 to 10. Again, boys showed much greater police involvement than girls. The number of white youth in both samples was too small to permit meaningful comparisons on the basis of race.

While the results of the study in Durham did not indicate so clearly as those in Cincinnati that NYC participation was accompanied by a decrease in delinquent behavior, the figures clearly evidence that, compared with the controls, Negro boys showed significantly improved social adjustment after enrollment in NYC—in spite of the fact that they were considered more severely maladjusted than the control group.

As mentioned earlier, the second phase of the 5-year longitudinal study included a second round of interviews, approximately a year later, of those subjects described in the first phase. In addition, it included a first round of interviews with enrollees who entered the NYC program during late 1966 and 1967 and a followup of their activities in the program. Followup information was obtained from 72 to 80 percent of the subjects. Also included were studies of program components designed to investigate aspects of program effectiveness.

For the second round of interviews, difficulties in locating enrollees who had left the program and also members of their control group had to be overcome, in many instances by substitutions. However, the interviewed subjects, the authors state, matched fairly well in numbers and in race/sex percentages.

The data gathered during this second part of the study supported the following observations made during the first phase:

—NYC is reaching seriously disadvantaged youth with major employability problems.

—Enrollees on the whole gave a good report on the usefulness of the NYC program and on the helpfulness of work supervisors and counselors.

—Negro girls gave the program the highest rating and stayed in the longest period.

—White boys gave the program the lowest rating and stayed in the shortest period.

—White enrollees were more disadvantaged than Negro participants, averaging a year less of school and rating lower in poise, speech, and self-confidence.

—Male enrollees were assigned most frequently to cleaning, maintenance, and unskilled labor positions.

—Female enrollees were assigned most frequently to clerical and professional aid positions.

—Enrollees gave greatest value to those program effects that tended to increase their employability.

There was no clear evidence that NYC enhanced the employability of the average enrollee. While unemployment remained high in both the experimental and the control groups, both male NYC enrollees and members of the control group also reported increases in employment since the first interview. This suggests that improved work adjustment is primarily associated with the fact that they were about a year older, that age and maturation are of fundamental significance to employment adjustment. For young women, the followup interviews supported the conclusion that with NYC experience they were somewhat more likely to be employed than comparable young women without that experience.

At the time of the first followup interview 31 percent of the young women were still in NYC. This had dropped to 12 percent at the time of the second followup interview. Employment outside the NYC had increased, but so had unemployment. Comparable changes had occurred in the control group, with the result that the proportions employed outside NYC and of those unemployed were substantially similar in the two groups. Employment in both groups was significantly higher among young women without children than among those with children, emphasizing the need for improved child-care facilities. There was evidence, however, that formal skill training, worksites with training and employment opportunities, job development and assistance with job placement were associated with increased post-NYC employment.

An attempt was made to gain insight into factors that might be associated with successful NYC outcomes. A "successful" subject was considered to be one who was employed at the time of interview in a job paying at least \$1.50 an hour, which had been held for at least 4 months. A subject was considered "unsuccessful" if unemployed at the time of the interview and principally supported by welfare assistance. Approximately one-third of the young men and one-fifth of the young women in the experimental group qualified as successful.

Age and education were found to be associated with work performance. The successful were older than the unsuccessful and had averaged higher high school grades. Among the young women, NYC placement help was most clearly associated with success, as more than one-third of the successful had found jobs in the sites of their NYC work experience. More of the successful had been referred to their jobs by NYC. No association was

found between success and length of time in NYC, the type of work performed, or ratings given to various aspects of the program—except for assistance in getting a job.

Provisions for remedial education differed somewhat between programs, but some kind of remedial education was a uniform program component. All programs attempted to utilize public education resources—with little success—and special NYC educational programs were also developed. The severe educational deficiencies of some enrollees and the difficulty of involving these same enrollees in any more education, together comprise an area of crucial importance to the effectiveness of the NYC.

Since no remedial education component in any of the studied programs was achieving satisfactory results with male enrollees, the Accelerated Learning Experiment was designed to provide for the experimental use and evaluation of new remedial techniques in NYC out-of-school programs.

A preliminary report on the Accelerated Learning Experiment, on which a further report is now in preparation, gives some information on the experiment, for which three cities were selected—St. Louis, Cincinnati, and Pittsburgh. Teachers from the three cities were brought together in Pittsburgh for training by a Job Corps trainer in the use of Job Corps materials. The factors considered important were:

- Primary emphasis on educating male enrollees.
- Coordination of education and counseling.
- Educational materials neither so difficult as to frustrate nor so easy as to deny a sense of achievement, but complex enough to provide a challenge.
- Flexibility enough to include within the same class students working at several different levels of achievement.
- Convenience of time and place of classes insofar as possible and, to the extent possible, location near NYC worksites.
- Use as teachers of high school graduates (or persons with some college) with proper motivation and personal qualities.

The design of this experimental educational program was worked out and general guidelines developed. After investigating several methods of programmed learning, it was decided to use the system developed for the Job Corps, which was structured from beginning reading and mathematics through the 7.5-grade level. The NYC director in each of the three cities took responsibility for administering the program. Before classroom work began, each enrollee was scheduled for a career-counseling

interview to help plan the future and increase motivation for education. Classes met 2 hours a day, 5 days a week, and time in class was paid for at the regular rate of pay. Classes began in the spring of 1968 and were composed mostly of boys.

At the end of the first 6 months, retention rate for the original male enrollees was 30 percent, for female enrollees 67 percent, and for the total group 40 percent. At the end of a little more than a year of operation, the teachers and administrators from the experimental sites met with educational consultants and other interested people to discuss the experiment. At any one time, approximately 40 to 50 out-of-school young men and women in each city were enrolled in the program. A report on the experiment is now in preparation, but some preliminary findings reflecting the year's experience and the discussion are available. The principal conclusions were:

- Remedial education programs should be decentralized, and classrooms located either in or near worksites.
- Classroom space should allow for unconventional seating arrangements and greater than usual storage and display facilities.
- The optimum number of enrollees per teacher may vary between eight and 15, depending on achievement level and behavioral characteristics of enrollees.
- Classes should meet daily, in the morning or before the work assignment; daily attendance should be required.
- Daily class time should be 3 hours for maximum effectiveness.
- Job Corps materials are, in general, satisfactory, but need some special procedures to remedy deficiencies for NYC use.
- No standardized tests have been found that are entirely adequate for individual evaluation and measurement of progress. Until such tests are available, this must remain a partially subjective process, dependent on the teacher.
- Using programmed material, high school graduates or those with some college experience can do very well as teachers. The most important qualification resides in the personal characteristics of the teacher.
- Since motivation is essential, an incentive system involving tangible and intangible rewards should be established.
- The remedial education component should be considered equally essential to the success of the NYC program as work experience and counseling. Whenever possible, teaching and counseling functions should be

combined. For some enrollees, remedial education classes should serve as meaningful work experience (more time should be spent in the educational program to prepare for job readiness).

Although the ultimate goal of the NYC program is meaningful work leading to job-readiness, more of the enrollees' time should be devoted to remedial education, the conference concluded. Upgrading the education achievement of the out-of-school enrollee is vital to making him job-ready, but an educational program without a clearly evident tie to employment will have little appeal for the enrollee. Every possible means should be explored to develop a close relationship between the NYC work experience and the educational component of the program.

Counseling, like remedial education, was a program "constant" that varied with local programs. In each program, the enrollee was assigned to the particular care of an NYC staff member, usually termed a "counselor." The quality and amount of counseling provided varied extensively among NYC programs.

As a work experience program, the NYC is focused on employment--on work experience during enrollment, and on a job after NYC experience. The importance of employment has received increasing attention from all the programs studied. Only one program however--in Cincinnati--had a job development and placement unit (discussed in the following pages). If other programs provided placement service, it was only through the more or less informal efforts of counselors and work supervisors, and in one program--St. Louis--work assignments for young men frequently led to permanent jobs.

Evidence is beginning to accumulate, the authors say, that work experience alone has little effect on the employment adjustment of enrollees after they leave the NYC program. A recurring theme is the importance of practical vocational assistance. The most appreciated aspect of NYC experience was help given to the enrollee in preparing himself for and obtaining a job. It appeared that the most effective way of assisting enrollees, particularly female enrollees, was to provide specific help in getting a job either through job referrals or employment opportunities at the worksite.

By itself, work experience had no appreciable effect on the employability of enrollees. It was only when the work experience was directly relevant to a post-NYC job that positive effects were noted. Other components of the program also had a noticeable effect only when they were job-related. The three principal ways to provide vocational assistance are job development, vocationally relevant work assignments, and formal skill training. Effective job development involves locating job opportu-

nities, working with employers to expand available opportunities, and helping enrollees improve their job-seeking behavior.

Public employment agencies, such as the YOC, have developed programs to help disadvantaged groups, but this study indicates that for the most part they are not yet giving substantial assistance to the types of youth enrolled in the NYC programs. There seems to be a conflict between the point of view of public and private employment agencies and the NYC, stemming from different criteria for judging program success. The employer becomes the most important client to be satisfied, and the best way to satisfy him is to send qualified candidates for all job openings. Under these circumstances, employment counselors may be reluctant to refer the typical out-of-school NYC enrollee for a job, since these youth are frequently employment risks. In the absence of effective job placement programs, the local NYC administrators may have no alternative but to undertake job development themselves.

While direct employability assistance may not be the only way to aid enrollees, it is the principal program component that can be demonstrated by this research to be effective. Three approaches to increase employability were found useful: Job development to increase the range of jobs available to enrollees; use of worksites for on-the-job training which can lead to employment; and specific skill training.

Thirty-five case studies are included in the report. These illustrate recurring situations and help in interpreting the data presented:

—The employability of enrollees is enhanced primarily through vocationally relevant NYC experience.

—Enrollees can be categorized according to their needs and various program strategies can be developed.

—The educational needs of enrollees require active and innovative intervention.

—The continuation of counseling responsibility into the post-NYC period can improve the employment adjustment of former enrollees.

—Combinations of multiple assignments, multiple enrollments, and maintained work standards appear to give the best results for some enrollees.

—NYC enrollment policy that concentrates on "hard core" youth tends to limit program effectiveness.

—Maximum effectiveness of program operation is achieved through a balance of program components.

Although some enrollees may need only a little assistance with finding a job, the majority need much more than this. They must acquire both skills and motivation before job placement can become effective.

NYC assignments that both introduce them to a possible career and give them an opportunity to receive relevant skill training on the job will help. Unfortunately, too few of the work assignments, particularly those for young men, provide the opportunity to apply this kind of assistance. Work assignments should provide specific training in skills for which there is demand in the local market.

The combination of formal skill training and on-the-job training is often an ideal arrangement. The formal training program develops a minimum level of competence in basic skills required by the job, and the on-the-job training provides practice in applying these skills in work situations. In a formal skill-training program, job categories should be selected for which there are ample employment opportunities and in which training at a minimal level of competence can be accomplished within 6 months. Initial training should be at a training center, to be followed by on-the-job training, with reassignment to the training center concentrating on work deficiencies reported by the work supervisor. Remedial education should be provided as required, with continuation of the work-cycle experience and formal training until the enrollee is considered ready for work. Then assistance should be provided in obtaining a job, and counseling should be continued until adequate adjustment to the job has been made.

The needs of enrollees cover a wide range. It seems apparent that the most useful approach is to consider each enrollee's particular needs and to adapt the program elements—work assignment, counseling, and remedial education—to meet those needs. While it is not possible to fit every individual's needs, broad strategies or "program mixes" can be developed which would permit a flexible response to enrollee employability needs and thus achieve a higher degree of program effectiveness.

At the time the youth enroll in the program, they should be classified according to type and a prescription prepared outlining a strategy for meeting the individual's needs, such as counseling regarding goals, desirable work experience, or remedial training. Each one's experience within NYC should be evaluated in relationship to this prescription and change made in the prescription as better understanding of the enrollee is achieved or his needs change.

A high proportion of enrollees, including some high school graduates, are so deficient in reading and arithmetic skills as to severely limit their employability. Thus, work-training programs need to be supplemented by a remedial education program if the enrollee is to become able to handle a responsible job. In terms of these educational needs of the enrollees, the educational

component of NYC programs was generally inadequate—particularly for male enrollees.

All of the NYC programs surveyed had difficulty finding adequate facilities for educating out-of-school youth and for motivating the youth when facilities are available. The problem lies both in the attitude of enrollees toward the school and the attitude of the school toward the enrollees. Many schools do not want these youth, have encouraged them to leave, and make it difficult for them to return to school full time. While the NYC program appears to stimulate participation in educational programs, particularly among male enrollees, the extent of this participation falls far below their needs.

There are many indications that terminated enrollees are often deficient in their skills, attitudes, and knowledge of the requirements of the working world. Even though such an enrollee may terminate to "permanent" employment, he can frequently be found in the ranks of the unemployed a few months later.

Several of the case studies included in this survey describe ex-enrollees who might have been helped to a satisfactory work adjustment if they had received advice and support during the difficult first months of post-NYC employment.

Seriously disadvantaged youth often need a number of chances—if a single opportunity were enough, most of them could succeed without special assistance programs. Many enrollees quit the NYC for the very reasons that will prevent them from achieving satisfactory employment: They can adjust no better to work than they did to work training. Termination of such enrollees is a form of program failure; a furlough, with the opportunity to start again regardless of the past, holds more promise of program effectiveness. It is important to maintain reasonable work standards in NYC assignments. Furloughs could provide reinforcement of NYC standards while preserving the program's commitment to the temporarily separated enrollee. This possibility is supported by the fact that some enrollees took as many as four separate enrollments before achieving successful adjustment to NYC.

The use of the concept of furlough instead of termination allows for withdrawal from the program without the stigma of failure. Rather, it has constructive implications for the enrollee and for the program. Also, the furlough concept puts the responsibility on the enrollee to decide to adjust to the NYC program. Thus an alternative is offered that allows one to learn to profit from a mistake instead of being punished for it. Thus, a "failure" on one job becomes a part of the growth process through which behavior may be modified.

A frequently advocated enrollment policy assigns priority to youth with the greatest employability problems,

holding that these "hard-core" unemployed youth have the greatest need for NYC experience and therefore should be helped before youth with less severe employability problems are enrolled. This study indicates that such a policy generally tends to decrease program effectiveness--including program effectiveness for these "hard-core" youth.

As might be expected, the NYC is most effective with disadvantaged youth who are relatively close to employability, who can be given realistic assistance, and for whom program concentration can be expected to provide the most remediation at the least cost. Program successes achieved in this way, furthermore, promote a reputation of effectiveness that serves to increase the motivation of future enrollees. Successful employment achieved through an NYC program increases its potential effectiveness for all enrollees, including "hard-core" youth.

There is an interaction effect among program components that makes it essential for the time to be distributed over all essential program elements and not concentrated on favored components. For example, effective job development increases the value of counseling by providing an attainable goal. On the other hand, effective counseling adds to the value of job development by improving the attitudes of enrollees, thus increasing the likelihood that they will be able to perform well on the job. Together, effective job develop-

ment and counseling will enhance the value of remedial education by raising the motivation of the enrollees which encourages them to try to learn. Conversely, effective remedial education will increase the job qualifications of the enrollee. The NYC program administrator needs to use a systems approach to the planning of his program and to pay close attention to the value of balance. Guidelines for developing a program model are included in the report.

Phase III of the longitudinal study is underway. Subjects interviewed during the second phase will be interviewed again a year later, at which time virtually all will have terminated from the program. Then program components, policies, and practices of post-NYC can be studied more intensively. The propositions set forth in this report will serve as hypotheses for guiding the later investigation.

Further work is also being conducted on the work relevant attitudes of optimism, self-confidence, and also on unsocialized attitudes. It is anticipated that a reliable measuring procedure will thus be developed.

Finally, it is hoped that an experiment may be conducted in which skill training is provided to male subjects following the Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op Program model. Meantime, a Skill-Training Model for NYC programs has been prepared and is under consideration for use on an experimental basis.

Cincinnati's Clerical Co-Op

A Study of the Effectiveness of Selected Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs: The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op: A Formal Skill Training Program by Regis S. Walther and Margaret L. Magnusson, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., April 1969 (Contract No.41-7-004-9).

The Cincinnati Clerical Co-Op is part of the NYC out-of-school program in that city. This study was initiated in the fall of 1966, as part of research covering the effectiveness of certain selected, special programs. Distinctive features of the co-op program included selection of trainees from the regular NYC programs, who had at least minimal clerical skills and expressed interest in clerical employment. Training consisted of alternating classroom work with actual work experience first in NYC-connected agencies, later in private firms and placement help when trainees had reached entry-level employability. Classroom work was directed toward weaknesses disclosed in the work assignments, and the cycle might be repeated as few or as many times as appeared necessary. At first, each phase of the cycle was set at 3 weeks, but later extended to 1 month.

The number of active enrollees in the co-op program ranged from 55 to 68 during the period covered by the study, with a followup of 127 enrollees after they left the co-op. Selection of participants for the co-op included testing on general ability, reading, arithmetic computation, clerical potential, dexterity, and typing. Both group and personal counseling were part of the program.

Although the co-op was selective, the personal and demographic characteristics of its enrollees were essentially similar to those of the regular NYC participants in Cincinnati. Almost all were young Negro women, with an average age of 19 years when they entered the program. Most of them had been out of school about 14 months and had completed the eleventh grade. They averaged a grade level of 8.4 in reading and 6.8 in math. Three-fourths had never married, but more than half had children, and pregnancy was frequently given as the reason for having dropped out of school. While responsibility for child care had attracted many of these

young women to NYC, child-care problems often interfered with their progress in the program. Over a fifth had recorded police contacts; about a fourth were from families on relief; and more than half had never held any job for longer than 30 days.

Interviewers rated the co-op subjects in the areas of speech, appearance, and attitude at the beginning and end of enrollment. While some improvement by all was noted, many of the young women made significant progress in each area. The most serious work problems encountered were in tardiness and absenteeism, but successive work assignments showed marked improvement in both areas. Some of the selected trainees were found to be in need of only a little help to become employable, so they did not need to participate in the work-experience portion of the program.

At the time of the post-co-op followup, the average time elapsed since they had been in the program was 11.5 months. Eighty-six were in the labor market, with 58 percent working full time, 4 percent part time, and 18 percent not working but looking for jobs. Eight of those employed were also in school, working to complete their high school education, and three were in MDTA training programs or the Job Corps. This post-co-op record offers strong presumptive evidence of the increased employability resulting from the program. Over half of those who had found jobs had done so through the co-op or the NYC staff, and almost a fourth through friends or relatives. Formal job-finding agencies had been used infrequently.

Co-op subjects reporting full-time employment at the time of followup had averaged 11.5 months of employment and 1.5 months of unemployment. They were asked to give the name of current or last employer. Employer reports indicated that a majority were in clerical work, and they rated a great majority (81 percent) as average or above in performance. Only seven

had been fired. Average hourly rate of pay was reported as \$1.82. Some employers commented very favorably on the effectiveness of the co-op training, on the basis of their experience with the "graduates."

Followup information indicated that the young women who had made the best adjustment to work and had been in their jobs for the longest periods of time were older than the less successful; they had spent considerably more time in the co-op work-training program; and they had completed at least half a grade more of high school. These girls were also significantly more optimistic about achieving their occupational goals, and they were rated by interviewers as having made greater overall improvement during the course of the program. Of significance regarding the program itself was the fact that more of the work training of the successful young women had been in private business, while those who were not doing so well had been assigned almost exclusively to NYC agencies.

The records of the co-op trainees were compared also with those of a control group who had had no regular NYC or co-op experience. The results indicated that the program had been a very significant factor in preparation for, and successful adjustment to, work.

Enrollees were asked to rate their experience in the program. Two-thirds of those who had left the program had gone into jobs, and 4 percent had entered other training or school. Only 12 percent had been terminated or had left because of dissatisfaction, and pregnancy and/or family problems accounted for 15 percent of the terminations. Most enrollees viewed the program as very helpful, although only about half rated either the help of the counselor or the supervisor as highly as that of the overall program. Enrollees viewed the program primarily as a learning experience through which they could prepare for employment, advance their education, and improve their social skills. The most disliked elements were associated with attitudes and character of staff and of other enrollees.

The study includes a number of case studies that illustrate how the program worked or did not work

and demonstrate the importance of help in placement.

Among the weaknesses of the program was failure to provide effective followup counseling immediately after placement. Multiple enrollments might have kept many of the terminees in the program. The authors propose that the use of furloughs for disciplinary terminations might have kept some in the program until successful completion.

The authors conclude that the success of the clerical co-operative program in Cincinnati indicates that it might, with modifications, serve as a model in other vocational areas. In any such formal skill-training program, certain elements were listed as essential:

- Selected job categories must be ones in which ample employment opportunities exist, and for which training for entry-level competence can be accomplished in a relatively short period (the authors suggest 6 months).

- Initial training, at a training center, should be for a period of from 3 to 6 weeks, depending on individual needs.

- On-the-job training periods should be for about 4 weeks, preferably at a worksite that provides opportunities for permanent employment. Repeated assignment to the same worksite was found to be most productive, although enrollees should be assigned to new worksites whenever this appears necessary.

- Reassignments to the training center should concentrate on work deficiencies reported by the work supervisor.

- Remedial education should be provided as needed.

- The cycle of work experience and formal training should be repeated until the trainee is judged ready for employment.

- Assistance in obtaining a job should be available after training has been completed.

- Followup counseling should be provided until adjustment to the job is adequate.

Followup on Terminated Enrollees

A Study of Terminated Enrollees in Three Urban Out-of-School Neighborhood Youth Corps Programs by Regis H. Walther and Margaret Magnusson, The George Washington University, Washington, D.C., February 1969 (Contract No. 41-7-004-9).

This report covers a study of youth who were separated from the out-of-school NYC program in Pittsburgh and Cincinnati. The termination sample consisted of 125 former enrollees whose program participation ended within a selected period in the last half of 1966. Information on the terminees was collected from NYC sources. The purpose of the study was to investigate the effect of different emphases on job development through comparison between (1) the two program operations in Pittsburgh, where one program (the city program) was centralized, with NYC services provided through its own staff, and the other (the HWA program) was decentralized, subcontracting all NYC services to its agencies;⁹ and (2) the Cincinnati program, which placed particular emphasis on job development (neither of the Pittsburgh projects emphasized this component of the program). The Cincinnati sample of terminees was also compared with a sample of 95 current enrollees in the Cincinnati program and the primary difference between the two groups was found to be the length of time in NYC—6.5 months for the terminees, 10.3 months for current enrollees. (A further objective was to investigate a low-cost technique that might serve as a model for self-evaluation by local NYC programs. The enrollee response in the self-evaluation phase of the study, however, was too low to permit use of the data.)

In most aspects the Pittsburgh and Cincinnati samples were similar. The average enrollee was slightly over 20 years old, had completed about 10 grades of school, and had been out of school about 17 months before applying for enrollment in the NYC. Over half of the enrollees were male; three-fourths, Negro. Comparisons indicated that variations in age and education were more apt to be associated with sex than race. Male enrollees were significantly lower in school grade completion (at least 1

year) in all three samples; they showed, as well, more serious socialization inadequacy; white enrollees tended to have less education than Negro enrollees of the same sex. Of special significance was the fact that nearly half of the female enrollees in Cincinnati and also in one of the Pittsburgh programs had graduated from high school. But high school graduation had not led to employment. The authors point out that this may indicate that graduates of ghetto high schools may suffer more from deficiencies in the educational system than from their own inadequacies. The young men had left school for "academic" or "disciplinary" reasons much more frequently than the young women.

The conditions of termination were divided into four types: Planned (employment, training, school, or military service); administrative (completion of standard term, ineligibility, etc.); premature, on NYC initiative (poor attendance, misconduct, etc.); and premature, other (quit, moved, married, pregnancy, etc.). A significant percentage in each sample left NYC within 3 months or less, and a substantial portion of these left because they had found jobs, or for further training, school, or service in the armed services. Some NYC enrollees appear to be almost ready for employment when they enter NYC and can be placed in employment within a very short time. In Pittsburgh there was little difference between the number of male and female short-term NYC experience participants; in Cincinnati a considerably higher percentage of the male enrollees left the program after 3 months or less. Counselors rated the terminees in the two Pittsburgh samples (these ratings were not available for Cincinnati) on overall improvement in employability, and in both cases the improvement of female enrollees was significantly higher than that of the male enrollees, with the greatest improvement in increased sense of responsibility. Little improvement was noted in reading, arithmetic, or writing, probably reflecting the lack of an adequate remedial

⁹The city program was sponsored by the Mayor's Committee on Human Resources, Inc., the HWA program, by the Health and Welfare Association of Allegheny County.

education program at the time these enrollees were in NYC.

Of the two Pittsburgh programs, the decentralized operations appeared to contribute to closer relationships between program personnel and enrollees and to enhance the value of counseling. The centralized operations, however, appeared to permit more flexibility of NYC assignments.

The emphasis on job development in one of the Pittsburgh programs and in Cincinnati appeared to be of

help in getting a job and in effective adjustment to work.

In general the results of the termination study agreed with the findings of the study of four urban out-of-school projects previously discussed. The termination study did, however, suggest that further evaluation of the effect of the length of NYC enrollment would be helpful, and also that followup counseling and remedial education might have made the difference between successful and unsuccessful work adjustment.